

A HISTORY OF
THE AMERICAN DRAMA
From the Civil War to the Present Day

ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN

R
812.09
Q
II

CONCORDIA LIBRARY
BRONXVILLE, N. Y.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

A HISTORY OF
THE AMERICAN DRAMA
FROM THE CIVIL WAR
TO THE PRESENT DAY



BOOKS BY
ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA
FROM THE BEGINNING TO THE CIVIL WAR

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA
FROM THE CIVIL WAR TO THE PRESENT DAY





With all best wishes,
Sincerely, Eugene O'Sullivan.

[From the bust by Edmond Quinn]

A HISTORY OF
THE AMERICAN DRAMA

From the Civil War to the Present Day

BY
ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN

*Author of "A History of the American Drama from
the Beginning to the Civil War"*

ILLUSTRATED

VOLUME II
FROM WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY
TO THE PRESENT DAY



HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS

NEW YORK AND LONDON

1927

26538

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA
FROM THE CIVIL WAR TO THE PRESENT DAY
COPYRIGHT, 1927, BY HARPER & BROTHERS
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES

FIRST EDITION

K-B

CONTENTS

XII. WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT 1

Changes in the drama and theatre with the turn of the century—The effect of the “syndicate” upon dramatists—Projects for betterment—The new dramatic generation—Moody’s leadership in the celebration of the individual protest against standardization of life—His verse dramas and their emphasis upon human dignity—The contrast between East and West in *The Great Divide*—Freedom and Puritanism—Emotional conflicts in *The Faith Healer*—Its plea for human love and faith—Moody’s influence on Josephine Preston Peabody and other playwrights—She wins the Stratford Prize with *The Piper*—Her protest against selfishness in *The Wolf of Gubbio*—Mary Austin’s *The Arrow Maker*, a revolt play among the Indians—Alice Brown’s *Children of Earth*, the revolt of the unmarried woman—*Kindling*, the protest against economic oppression—Literature and the drama draw nearer.

XIII. PERCY MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE 27

The drama as a stage picture—Grouping, design and color—The poetic drama—Chaucer lives among his characters in *The Canterbury Pilgrims*—MacKaye’s interpretation of *Jeanne D’Arc* saves Sothern and Marlowe’s season—Oriental romance in *A Thousand Years Ago*—Tragedy of the ludicrous in *The Scarecrow*—Satire of the European pessimists in *Anti-Matrimony*—The Kentucky mountaineer in *This Fine-Pretty World*—MacKaye’s open air masques—*St. Louis*, a civic play—*Caliban*, a celebration of human growth, through love and art—His ballad-play, *Washington*—Operas—The community spec-

tacle—*The Mission Play*—*The Pilgrimage Play*—*The Pilgrim Spirit*—College masques—Limitations of the species.

XIV. RACHEL CROTHERS AND THE FEMININE CRITICISM OF LIFE 50

The woman speaks in the drama—*The Three of Us* reveals the woman as an active force—Criticism of social organization in *A Man's World*—Man and wife as rival artists in *He and She*—*Ourselfs*, a revelation of woman's responsibility for the "double standard"—Morals and manners since the War in *Nice People* and *Mary the Third*—Satire upon the cult of self-expression in *Expressing Willie*.

XV. MITCHELL, WILLIAMS AND THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY 62

Distinction between social and domestic drama—Langdon Mitchell's *Becky Sharp* and *The New York Idea*—His knowledge of social values—Jesse Lynch Williams' scrutiny of social institutions in *Why Marry?* and *Why Not?*—A. E. Thomas, Thompson Buchanan, and other social satirists—Clare Kummer strikes a new note—James Forbes' *The Famous Mrs. Fair*—Gilbert Emery's *Episode*—The new generation produces Philip Barry—The flavor of *You and I*, *In a Garden*, and *White Wings*—Difficulties of writing social comedy in the United States.

XVI. EDWARD SHELDON, PLAYWRIGHT OF PASSION AND ASPIRATION 86

The variety of Sheldon's work—The realism of *Salvation Nell*—The tragedy of *The Nigger*—*The Boss* dramatizes the fable of Beauty and the Beast—Show-life in *The Princess Zim-Zim*—The search for beauty in *The High Road*—*Romance* goes around the world—Sheldon establishes himself as a poet in *The Garden of Paradise*—Illness and later collaborations—His philosophy of aspiration, frequently in conflict with passion.

XVII. THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA 100

The nature and standards of melodrama—The earlier melodrama, *In Old Kentucky*—The transition in the work of Broadhurst—Klein's attack on abuses of the day—Walter's more searching studies of life—The fallacy of *The Easiest Way*—More sincere treatment of character in *Fine Feathers*—New stage mechanics in *On Trial*—Contemporary melodramas and the "crook play"—No real progress; only more activity.

XVIII. COMEDY TYPES AGAIN 113

George Ade and the satire of the Middle West—George Cohan and the comedy-melodrama—Difference in their work—James Forbes' satire of suburban and theatrical life—The "clean play" of Winchell Smith—*Lightnin'*, the reason for its appeal—Frank Craven's *First Year*—Anne Nichols' *Abie's Irish Rose*—Analysis of its success—Limitations of the type play.

XIX. THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY 123

Edwin Royle and the transition from the earlier romance—*The Squaw Man*—Booth Tarkington's *Beaucaire*—International romance in *The Man from Home*—The exotic romance—Richard Walton Tully's *The Bird of Paradise*—*The Yellow Jacket*, by Hazelton and Benrimo—Edward Knoblock's *Kismet*—His *Milestones* and other period plays—Philip Moeller and the romance of history—*Madame Sand* and *Molière*—Eaton's *Queen Victoria*—Zoë Akins and the sophisticated romance—The fanciful romance; Eleanor Gates' *The Poor Little Rich Girl*—John T. McIntyre's *A Young Man's Fancy*—The opera—Brian Hooker's *Mona*—*The King's Henchman* by Edna Millay—The poetic drama—Arthur Goodrich's *Caponsacchi*—E. C. Carpenter and the romance of familiar life—Charles Rann Kennedy and the ethical romance—Martin Flavin and the romance of the occult.

XX. CHANGING CONDITIONS OF THE THEATRE 158

The rivalry of the moving picture—The decline of the traveling company on the road—The excessive competition and high rents in New York City—Effect on the playwright—Decline at the end of the first decade—The rise of the independent theatres—The Neighborhood Playhouse; The Washington Square Players; The Provincetown Players—Breaking down of the line between professional and amateur—Little Theatres—Conferences on American Drama—The revolt of the nation against the domination of New York—The growing emphasis upon the playwright.

XXI. EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC. . . . 165

The O'Neill myth—His love of adventure—Acting and reporting—One-act plays and the Provincetown Players—The drama of the sea in *The S. S. Glencairn*—Reality of his characters—*Ile*—*Beyond the Horizon*, the tragedy of frustrated dreams—*The Straw*, a powerful study of unquenchable hope—*Anna Christie*, a drama of fate and regeneration—O'Neill's own interpretation of the ending—In *The Emperor Jones*, O'Neill establishes the new unity of impression—Social satire in *The First Man*—Symbolism of *The Hairy Ape*, a drama of misguided power—*Welded*, and the torment of mutual passion—Romantic symbolism in *The Fountain*, in which O'Neill begins a new period in his art—*All God's Chillun Got Wings*, another tragedy of frustrated aspiration—*Desire Under the Elms*, the ironic treatment of passion—Triumph of symbolism in *The Great God Brown*, the protest of the creative artist—O'Neill's interpretation of the symbolism—The brilliant satire of modern commercialism in *Marco Millions*—The world artist strikes the universal note in *Lazarus Laughed*—O'Neill's statement of his philosophy of composition—His place in our literature—The nobility of his conception of humanity—O'Neill the mystic—His Celtic heritage—Hawthorne and O'Neill; their sympathy with sinners—The poet of aspiration.

CONTENTS

ix

XXII. THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER 207

The effect of the War upon drama in sharpening the scrutiny of life and institutions—The attempt to deal sincerely with character—Zona Gale and Susan Glaspell, examples of the drama of revolt—The domestic drama reaches a high point in *The Hero* by Gilbert Emery—His other plays—Owen Davis leaves melodrama for better things—The domestic comedy of Kaufman and Connelly—George Kelly's shrewd observation of life—The imaginative touch in Sidney Howard and Maxwell Anderson—Other playwrights of the domestic drama.

XXIII. THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES 240

The dramatic material in primitive American life—The Playmakers' Theatre in North Carolina, under F. H. Koch—Paul Green's plays of the mountaineers and the negroes—*In Abraham's Bosom*—Other mountain plays—Lula Vollmer's *Sun-Up*—Hatcher Hughes' *Hell-Bent fer Heaven*—Significance of the impulse.

XXIV. A WORD IN RETROSPECT 250

BIBLIOGRAPHY, INCLUDING A LIST OF AMERICAN PLAYS, 1860-1927 255

INDEX 337

ILLUSTRATIONS

EUGENE O'NEILL	<i>Frontispiece</i>
WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY	<i>facing p. 12</i>
PERCY MACKAYE	" 30
RACHEL CROTHERS	" 50
LANGDON MITCHELL	" 62
JESSE LYNCH WILLIAMS	" 70
PHILIP BARRY	" 84
EDWARD SHELDON	" 92
OWEN DAVIS	" 110
FACSIMILE OF LETTER FROM EUGENE O'NEILL . .	" 198
GILBERT EMERY	" 212
GEORGE KELLY	" 226
SIDNEY HOWARD	" 232
A SCENE FROM <i>The Scuffletown Outlaws</i> , A PLAY OF THE NORTH CAROLINA MOUNTAINEERS	" 242

A HISTORY OF
THE AMERICAN DRAMA
VOLUME TWO
FROM WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY
TO THE PRESENT DAY



CHAPTER XII

WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

IT WOULD be idle to emphasize unduly the change that came over the drama with the advent of the Twentieth Century, but it was real and significant. Daly died in 1899, Hoyt in 1900, Herne in 1901, and, while Howard wrote *Kate* in 1906 and Harrigan *Under Cover* in 1903, their important work belongs to the Nineteenth Century. Of those born after 1850, Gillette probably changed least in material and method. Belasco, with his singular capacity for adjustment, Thomas with his liberal receptivity to new ideas, and Fitch with his keen sense of social fluctuations, steadily developed, in power and achievement, during the first decade of the new century.

It is only natural that the turn of the century should stimulate creative artists to new endeavor. Human desire for change and experiment seizes such an occasion to express itself, and if the distinction between originality and mere difference of manner is often confused, there is beneath all the froth and eccentricity an undercurrent of hope and sincerity. Our drama shares with our lyric poetry and our fiction the quickening impulse of the new era, and if the strands of progress are not so easy to disentangle from the mesh of abortive effort, both in the drama and in the theatre, it is rather because of the excess of projects for their betterment than through lack of them.

Generalizations concerning the drama are always dangerous because of its dependence upon external conditions, and we are still so close to the times with which we are concerned that a perspective is difficult to establish. Moreover, the fruition of the new movement was delayed by unfortunate condi-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

tions in the theatre, and even when it seemed to have become established, the early death of the playwright who was in a sense the pioneer deprived our dramatic literature of what would probably have been its chief ornament. The easiest method of procedure would be to present analyses of the individual dramatists and leave to the future the co-ordination of their work, but the historian of the drama cannot shirk the duty of classification. For, owing to the large number of playwrights who have produced a few plays of significance, the drama of the Twentieth Century must still be studied largely through its types and tendencies.

When we review the condition both of the drama and of the theatre in 1900, the outlook was certainly not encouraging. The establishment of international copyright in 1891, from which so much had been hoped, had not yet affected the situation to any great degree. The leading producers still looked abroad for material, though several object lessons had been taught them. Contemporary criticism, with a few honorable exceptions, while it preached encouragement to the American playwright theoretically, was rarely helpful in individual cases and was seldom discriminating. If the historian were to depend upon the newspaper of that day, unchecked by his own memory or by the saner judgment of the more careful reviews, the theatre and the drama were both apparently in ruins.

Of course this pessimism with regard to the theatre is chronic, and has not been limited to America. But certain of the discouraging features were the peculiar product of local conditions. The growth of the "syndicate," or the combination of theatrical interests formed in 1896, primarily to control the bookings on "the road," as the territory outside of New York City is still called, was harmful, as any monopoly is harmful. It placed the control of the theatre in the hands of those who were concerned chiefly with its commercial aspects, and it drove the actor-manager like Herne or Belasco to make terms or leave the stage. This syndicate in turn met successful rivalry, and competition was to a certain degree restored. But

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

it was still a difficult matter to put on a play unless the producing manager could secure the necessary bookings to ensure a successful tour on the road after or before his run in New York. This condition hurt the dramatist just as the warfare of the two syndicates helped him to a certain extent by providing more opportunities. The playwrights who had been hampered during the past by the necessity of writing to suit a particular actor or actress, now had to share with these a domination which was less personal but based its actions entirely upon a supposed public taste which was largely imaginary. Public opinion, too, was shocked by the fire in the Iroquois Theatre in Chicago, on December 30, 1903, in which 588 people lost their lives.

The very difficulties of the situation led to attempts at its cure. While the critics were deploring the scarcity of good plays, the exploiting of incompetent stars, the excess of theatres, the New Theatre in Chicago was established in 1906 and the New Theatre in New York in 1909. These commendable projects were both failures. The collapse of the latter has been blamed upon the large size of the building, which forbade the production that demands an intimate relation of the actor and his audience. But an examination of the list of the plays produced suggests another reason. The New Theatre in Chicago offered but one American play during its repertoire season, and that one, *The Spoilers*, while of no especial distinction, was the only play that was financially successful. The New Theatre in New York offered during its first season one American play, *The Nigger*. After all, the main function of the theatre in America should be the encouragement of the American playwright, for the theatre is transitory, the drama permanent. Yet notwithstanding the failure of these two experiments, the discussion they evolved certainly was helpful in calling attention to the serious necessity of intelligent support of the stage. The inception of George Pierce Baker's course in playwriting at Harvard in 1905 indicates the beginning of an important movement in the colleges in the United States,

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

and the foundation of the Society of Dramatic Authors in 1906 was also significant.

It was in 1906, too, that signs of the new dramatic generation became apparent. A survey of the plays of the previous seasons presents a sharp contrast. When the century opened the vogue of dramatized novels was at its height. With leading actors and actresses like Crane, John Drew, Mary Mannering, Maude Adams and J. K. Hackett producing *David Harum*, *Richard Carvel*, *Janice Meredith*, *The Little Minister*, and *The Pride of Jennico*, the effect on the American playwright was not a happy one. Mansfield's production of *Monsieur Beaucaire* was somewhat more encouraging, for here Tarkington was both playwright and novelist. Outside of *Beaucaire*, however, the season of 1900-1 in New York was barren, except for *The Climbers*, *Captain Jinks* and *Du Barry*. In 1901-2 *The Stubbornness of Geraldine* and *The Darling of the Gods* were the leading plays, with Thomas's *Colorado* a failure, and his dramatization of *Soldiers of Fortune* revealing the trend of popular favor.

In 1903-4 the leading plays were Thomas's *The Other Girl*, Fitch's *Her Own Way*, and George Ade's *The County Chairman*. In 1904-5 they were Belasco and Long's *Adrea*, Fitch's *The Woman in the Case*, and McLellan's *Leah Kleschna*; in 1905-6, Fitch's *Her Great Match*, Klein's *The Lion and the Mouse*, Thomas's *De Lancey*, Royle's *The Squaw Man*, and Ade's *Just Out of College*. One has to include Klein's melodrama, of doubtful merit, and Ade's boisterous comedy of types to make even a passable showing. Then in 1906-7 came from the established playwrights Fitch's *The Truth* and *The Straight Road*, Gillette's *Clarice*, Belasco's *Rose of the Rancho*, and George Broadhurst's best play, *The Man of the Hour*; and even more significant, in Langdon Mitchell's *The New York Idea*, Moody's *The Great Divide*, MacKaye's *Jeanne D'Arc*, and Rachel Crothers's *The Three of Us*, we have the advance guard of the new drama. In one year we have about as many permanent additions to our dramatic

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

literature as in the five years previous. In 1907-8 Thomas's *The Witching Hour*, Kennedy's *The Servant in the House*, Walter's *Paid in Full*, MacKaye's *Sappho and Phaon*, indicate if not so rich a list, at least some quite significant plays. In 1908-9 Sheldon's *Salvation Nell*, Walter's *The Easiest Way*, Tarkington's *A Man from Home*, MacKaye's *Mater*, continue the growing list of new playwrights. In 1909-10 Thomas's *The Harvest Moon*, Moody's *The Faith Healer*, Fitch's *The City*, Miss Peabody's *The Piper*, MacKaye's *Canterbury Pilgrims*, Sheldon's *The Nigger*, and Miss Crothers' *A Man's World*, revealed the serious attempt at a drama of sincerity.

One of the most salient characteristics of the new drama lay in its emphasis upon the individual's right to self-expression. Drama, of course, has always been concerned with the struggle of the individual against some opposing force, but there has been a progress, or at least a difference, in the forces selected as his antagonists. When Godfrey wrote his *Prince of Parthia* in 1759, his hero was a prince fighting against the tyranny of a paternal sovereign. In the period from the Revolution to 1850 the heroes of *Pelopidas*, *The Gladiator*, *The Bride of Genoa*, and *Sertorius* were battling against political tyranny. Even in 1835, Conrad saw the passing of this motive, and he made Jack Cade a leader of the peasants in their struggle for personal and economic rights. After the Civil War, the struggle between labor and capital naturally presented itself as a fit subject for dramatic treatment, and it is surprising, at first glance, that so few plays of importance were written in America upon this theme. Augustus Thomas would have been the natural leader in such a drama, but the failure of *New Blood* discouraged him. The subject is touched lightly in *The Capitol*, and novels like *The Pit* were dramatized, but the chief vogue of the capital and labor play seems to be in melodrama like Klein's *Daughters of Men* (1906), in which, curiously enough, the same solution for the problem is suggested as that offered by John Galsworthy three years later in *Strife*. Perhaps it was the general conviction that the labor unions might

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

well be left to conduct the struggle with capital, and that it was a contest of organization with organization, in which the individual ran fairly even chances of being submerged. Labor and capital were already meeting upon equal terms, and, while in one way this should have provided stronger situations, yet it took away the possibility of sharp contrasts between opulence and misery, of which European drama makes use. Such scenes between the tyrannical employer and the cringing employees as are presented in Björnson's *Beyond Human Might* (1895) would have left American audiences cold. And as has already been suggested, the New York audiences, consisting largely of the well-to-do, were not especially sympathetic to the theme. When a sporadic play like *Kindling* (1911) appeared, it was saved by Chicago auditors and not by those of New York, and indeed the economic elements already seemed old-fashioned.

The individual having won his political rights in the first half of the Nineteenth Century and his economic status in the second half, became concerned toward the close of that century with the salvation of his personality from the dangers that lay in the increasing complexities of the social organization, in the standardization of life, in the prejudices and stupidities which prevent a full and free expression of each human soul. This feeling was worldwide, and took on a more virulent form on the continent of Europe than it did in America or even in England. Under the influence of Ibsen and Strindberg, European dramatists faced and revealed the cankers of life in their celebration of personal liberty, but our drama has followed them infrequently although it has been affected somewhat in its technique.

The drama of revolt in America took a different direction, less direct and obvious in the searching out of disease and degradation, but quite as profound in its own way. This is not the place to discuss relative values, but it must be recognized that great as the power of Ibsen and Strindberg may be, they

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

present those facts of life which men must forget if life is to be noble or even endurable.

The American dramatists in general deal with the growth of spiritual life through the evolution of character. They have recognized that the preservation of character is much more important than the preservation of personality, of which indeed we are suffering at present from an excess. This motive runs through various phases in the first quarter of the new century, but one of its most striking manifestations is associated with the name of William Vaughn Moody.

Moody was born in Spencer, Indiana, July 8, 1869, his father coming from New York and being of English and French ancestry, as his mother was mingled English and German. Moody had to make his own way from the beginning and taught in public and private schools before he entered Harvard College in 1889. Completing the work for a degree in three years, he went as tutor to Europe and came in contact with German, Italian and Grecian influences. He returned to Harvard for two years as graduate student and instructor, and then became connected with the English Department at the University of Chicago, actively teaching until 1902 and preserving for some years thereafter a nominal connection. The authorities of the University wished to retain his services, but Moody had determined that his real work lay in lyric poetry and drama, and he resolutely maintained his independence. His scholarly publications show his interest in Milton and Bunyan, but his *History of English Literature* was written to provide means to support him while he was enriching his experiences with travel, in the West and abroad.

Moody's letters reveal his careful approach to his subjects and his absorption in his poetic work. While his first published drama, *The Masque of Judgment*, appeared in 1900, it had been begun in 1897. It has not been produced on the stage, but in the case of Moody his work must be considered in its entirety, for his dramas, in both verse and prose, represent a conception of life which is essentially dramatic. Indeed, two

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

of his verse dramas would have been performed except for accidental circumstances, and may be produced at any time. *The Masque of Judgment* celebrates the conflict between God and the creatures, good and evil, that he has created. This dramatic poem stretches from the Incarnation to the Day of Judgment, and in its personnel and background it is Miltonic and reveals Moody's close study of the Bible. Raphael is the protagonist, and through his conversation with Michael and Uriel the drama progresses in flexible verse, interspersed with exquisite lyric poetry in varying measures. Step by step, with what seems to Moody remorseless logic, he pursues the purpose of God in His creation and judgment of man until it ends in destruction. God to him is the creator not only of good but also of evil, and the Serpent typifies the evil that broods beneath, waiting for God's mistake. This mistake lies in God's failure to make the highest use of the individual will and desires of man, which He has planted in humanity, and for which He is responsible. To Moody the preservation of the individual's own dignity is all important. It is righteous in him to carry out those desires, physical and intellectual, which are part of his divinity, even if they lead him to rebellion against the Most High.

Michael represents the Hebraistic attitude that the lost were punished for their sins; Uriel urges that "the violence and the unclean acts were His," but Raphael answers:

Snatch not
From brows abased the crown of personal will
Which made them noble, though it brought them down.

There is an insistence upon the doctrine of free will even at the cost of rebellion, or as Uriel says:

Man's violence was earnest of his strength,
His sin a heady overflow, dynamic
Unto all lovely uses, to be curbed
And sweetened, never broken with the rod!

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

Raphael is the representative of the angelic sympathy with humanity, and it was this phase of the work, the significance of human life, that Moody felt was most important. Raphael says in the third act:

O heart of man, how I have loved thee!
Hidden in sunlight what sweet hours were mine
Of lover-like espial upon thine;
Thrilled with thy shadowy fears, half guessing
The hope that lit thy veins like wine,
Musing why this was bane and that thy blessing,
My angel-ichor moved by all that moved thee;
Though oft the meanings of thy joy and woe
Were hid, were hard to know;
For deep beneath the clear crystalline waters
That feed the hearts of Heaven's sons and daughters,
The roots of thy life go.

There is Milton in the music of Moody's verse, but in the celebration of individual revolt, Moody has gone a step further than Milton. God is not to be considered as an all-powerful Deity, separate and distinct from His created servants. He is rather a compound of impulses, some high and some low, and in the working out of these impulses man is created and also the Serpent, the spirit of evil. God, failing to make use of all the forces of man, and punishing man for following out his impulses, is finally conquered by the Serpent. The Serpent himself is not left triumphant, however, for as Uriel remarks:

Sorrow dies with the heart it feeds upon.

The Masque of Judgment, if taken by itself, would be misleading. The rebellion of man and the spirit of Evil were not, in Moody's conception, of supreme importance. To him the great theme of the projected trilogy was the unity of God and man. If one is destroyed, then so is the other, and Evil was to him rather a manifestation than an actual force. Christ,

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the supreme union of God and man, was the binding force of the trilogy, even though He does not appear in it. So the second verse drama, *The Fire Bringer* (1904), while it is laid in an earlier time, is spiritually a step forward. Its profound and noble treatment of the saviour of men cannot here be adequately discussed from the point of view of poetry, but it must be noted that as drama it marks a distinct advance over *The Masque of Judgment*, while in its purely lyrical quality it contains, especially in Pandora's songs, some of the finest utterances of Moody. The humanity grows even deeper, the structure grows more compact, the motives are more direct and the action becomes more concrete. It was intended for stage presentation, and plans were made to produce it at the New Theatre in Chicago, but it has not yet been performed. It is based on the story of Prometheus, and represents his struggle with the gods and his punishment by Zeus because he has scaled the heights of Olympus and brought back fire to Deukalion and Pyrrha, whom he had warned, in time, of the deluge. Again the supreme duty of rebellion is stressed.

The Death of Eve, the third member of the trilogy, was to have expressed the reconciliation of God and man through the woman who had apparently separated them. The first Act, which alone has been published, brings Eve back to Cain's city, which the arch-rebel rules in his declining strength, in order that she may lead him back with her to the place of her original sin. In the remaining portions of the drama, Adam in his broken age was to have followed her, and Eve, relieved of her long-borne burden, was to have seen in the love story of her descendants the solution of the eternal problem of the human race. Eve was to Moody the combination of God's creature and the foreshadowing of the Mother of God, and was the concrete expression of the impossibility of any separation of God and man. The fragment of *The Death of Eve*, which forms a unified act, was scheduled for production by Stuart Walker, representing the Poetry Society, in New York in February, 1924, but the performance had to be postponed. Of the verse

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

dramas, it is clearly the best suited for stage production. The progress in unity and concreteness continues, and the limitation of the characters to human beings is a distinct advantage. Eve is the eternal mother. In Jubal's words:

She saw Creation's morning; she will stay
To watch the everlasting twilight fall.

But she becomes also the individual mother of Cain, the author of his sin as of his life, who takes upon herself his guilt.

As late as 1904, Moody wrote to Percy MacKaye that "I am heart and soul dedicated to the conviction that modern life can be presented on the stage in the poetic mediums and adequately presented only in that manner." But he was also deeply impressed by the importance of the practical considerations of the stage, and his association, beginning in 1898, with the men who were contributing to the theatre in New York probably shaped his decision to write in prose.

The actual composition of *The Great Divide* was the result, however, of an incident which was brought to his attention by Mrs. Moody. She had heard the story of a girl of her acquaintance who had gone with her brother to a cabin in the West, had been left alone and had been attacked by three men. She had appealed to one to save her from the others and had agreed to marry him. The marriage did not turn out successfully, and resulted in divorce. Moody became possessed with the dramatic possibilities of this theme and interrupted his other plans to write a play. *The Great Divide* was first produced by Miss Margaret Anglin under the title of *The Sabine Woman* at the Garrick Theatre, Chicago, April 12, 1906. On October 3 it was played by Henry Miller and Margaret Anglin at the Princess Theatre, New York, had a long run there and went on tour. In 1909 it was produced for a short time in London, with Edith Wynne Matthison in the part of Ruth Jordan, originally created by Miss Anglin.

The central theme of *The Great Divide* is the contrast between Ruth Jordan, the product of generations of New Eng-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

land ancestry, of inherited Puritan traditions and inhibitions, and Stephen Ghent, the man in the making, the freer spirit of the West, who is the master of his own impulses and is his own lawgiver. We shall fail to understand *The Great Divide* if we disregard Moody's verse dramas, for in Stephen Ghent, Moody transferred to prose and to contemporary America the ideal of personal independence which had its first flowering in *The Masque of Judgment* and *The Fire Bringer*. It is because Stephen Ghent is redolent of the soil that he made his popular appeal; but it is because he is the embodiment of a universal character that the play becomes a permanent addition to literature.

Moody had visited the Rocky Mountains with Hamlin Garland in 1901, and had spent some time in the Arizona desert in 1904. *The Great Divide*, however, was not inspired by Moody's interest in the West, which did not become keen until after his visit there in 1905, when he met the painter, Louis Aiken, who was living in a Hopi Village, and lived with him for a short time. Then he wandered out to a sheep ranch and spent a short time with the herders. These experiences are slightly reflected in *The Faith Healer*, but *The Great Divide* was prompted by his interest in a human story more than by the influence of locality. *The Great Divide* in fact had already been written before this visit, and yet its setting impresses one with its fidelity to the spirit of the West. The opening scene, in which Ruth, left alone in her brother's cabin, is attacked by three half-drunken men, is elemental in its swift development of character. Ruth has refused to marry Winthrop Newbury, her girlhood's friend, because he is "finished"; she longs for a more primitive mate, who has prospects of growth. When Stephen Ghent accepts her appeal to save her from the others at his own price, she instinctively responds to the call which his nature makes to hers. In the published play, revised by Moody in 1909, there is no mention of marriage in the first Act, and the drama gains in strength by the omission of any



WILLIAM VAUGHN MOODY

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

discussion between them about the details of her bargain. He reads in her note to her brother what her own conception of their relation is to be, and that is enough for the present. There are several melodramatic touches in this scene, such as the kissing of her mother's photograph good-by, but it was a successful stage picture and was an original and fresh contrast between man and woman, for Ghent was a far cry from the heroes of *Wolfville* or *The Girl of the Golden West*.

The play develops as a contrast of character. Ghent rises materially and spiritually; Ruth tortures herself with the old Puritanic conscience, and fights even against happiness unless it proceeds, through discipline, to regeneration. Ghent simply cannot understand her refusal to accept their situation or her abandonment of him and return to her own people. He follows her to her home and, with the help of their new bond in the child that has been born to her, he makes his fight successfully against the portraits of her ancestors, for her heart fights for him.

Ghent: Ruth, it's these fellows are fooling you! It's they who keep your head set on the wages of sin, and all that rubbish. What have we got to do with suffering and sacrifice? That may be the law for some, and I've tried hard to see it as our law, and thought I had succeeded. But I haven't! Our law is joy, and selfishness; the curve of your shoulder and the light on your hair as you sit there says that as plain as preaching. Does it gall you the way we came together? You asked me that night what brought me, and I told you whiskey, and sun, and the devil. Well, I tell you now I'm thankful on my knees for all three! Does it rankle in your mind that I took you when I could get you, by main strength and fraud? I guess most good women are taken that way, if they only knew it. Don't you want to be paid for? I guess every wife is paid for in some good coin or other. And as for you, I've paid for you not only with a trumpery chain, but with the heart in my breast, do you hear? That's one thing you can't throw back at me—the man you've made of me, the life and the meaning of life you've showed me the way to!

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

The Faith Healer was produced at the Century Theatre, March 15, 1909, in St. Louis, by Henry Miller, then in New York, January 19, 1910, and at Cambridge, Massachusetts, on January 24. It was not a popular success, but in some respects it is a finer play than *The Great Divide*, and its inherent dramatic qualities were apparent even in its recent revival in the moving pictures. While it followed *The Great Divide* on the stage, it was one of the earliest of Moody's conceptions. In 1895 he wrote to D. G. Mason, "I am losing sleep over a play dealing with a character and a situation which seem to me intensely significant and eloquent, that of Slatter, the 'New Mexico Messiah,' who has been doing things in Denver of late." At first he intended the drama to be in verse, but in 1899 he wrote the first draft, a play of about one hour in length, in prose. It was constantly in his mind, but the revision for the stage, even then not final, came in 1908, after the severe attack of typhoid fever which was the primary cause of his premature death in 1910.

Even before he heard of Slatter, Moody had conceived the idea of writing a play which should express the struggle between human love and the dedication to a mission. Moody's early feeling, as revealed in his lyric, "Road Hymn for the Start," is that a man should renounce his love and devote himself to the fulfillment of his mission. In a later mood he was inclined to have the hero renounce his mission in favor of love. But during the years in which *The Faith Healer* was slowly taking shape, it came to him that love and work could be facets of the same life, and one of the chief merits of the play lies in the way in which Moody, with delicate shades of understanding, showed that, by substituting for the selfishness of the personal claim the more impersonal and unselfish type of love, the hero could make a resolution of his problem which included every aspect of a man's life and aspiration. To have let the play run on to tragedy would have been not a more logical but a more obvious treatment.

He chose a faith healer for his hero because the choice

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

afforded him intense emotional conflicts, and he laid the scene in a farmhouse in the Middle West where he had grown to manhood and where such an emotional situation has not been infrequent. The wanderings of Ulrich Michaelis have led him to the household of Matthew Beeler, a well-drawn type of farmer, who keeps portraits of Darwin and Spencer on his walls, and whose skepticism yields with difficulty even when his wife, Mary, under Michaelis' treatment, walks for the first time in five years. This cure naturally forms the climax of action in the first Act, but Moody at once proceeds to a higher climax of character. As Mary Beeler, flushed with the hope that comes to her after five weary years, calls out to him that his hour has come and the crowd waiting outside for his ministration is ready, Michaelis falters, for his love for Rhoda, the young niece of Mary, seems to him to be an obstacle to his great mission. In the second Act, the external forces that oppose him are Dr. Littlefield, the modern physician, who represents the intolerant dogmatism of science, and the Reverend John Culpepper, the clergyman, who represents the age-long clerical opposition to the occult. Littlefield is no abstraction; he has been Rhoda's lover in earlier days, and their relations, rising from the past, make her feel that her love for Michaelis will be his destruction. He loses his grip upon his own self-trust, and as his confidence goes, his power to heal fails. Mary Beeler relapses to her former helplessness, and the little child who has been brought to him to heal fails to respond to his treatment. The curtain of the second Act falls on his broken-hearted cry of disillusionment. Then Rhoda tells him her story:

I thought that love had come to me. Girls are so eager for love. They snatch at the shadow of it. . . . I am not trying to plead for myself. . . . But I have told you the truth. I have set you free. I have given you back your mission.

But Michaelis does not accept this release. First he routs Littlefield, who returns with insolent proposals to Rhoda, then,

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

as the power of his faith returns, the whole tone of the play rises to a high plane of spiritual hope. It is Easter morning; Mary Beeler feels the stir of some great beauty coming. She walks once more at Michaelis' command, and when Rhoda turns to Michaelis and tells him that she too is happy since she has delivered him from the influence that was hampering him, he replies:

A little while ago you told me your life's bitter story. I tasted your struggle, went down with you into the depths of your anguish, and in those depths,—the miracle! . . . Out of those depths arose new-born happiness and new-risen hope. For in those star-lit depths of pain and grief, I had found at last true love. . . . You needed all the powers I had thrown away for your sake. You needed what the whole world needs—healing, healing, and as I rose to meet that need, the power that I had lost poured back into my soul.

Rhoda: Oh, if I thought that could be!

Michaelis: By the mystery that is man, and the mercy that is God, I say it is so.

The Faith Healer is the most significant of Moody's dramas because the theme is largest and the treatment most secure. More concrete than the verse dramas, it has a deeper imaginative quality than *The Great Divide*. One of his earliest conceptions, it was Moody's final plea for the dignity of human love and human faith. Its inherent nobility can best be appreciated when we compare it with the sordid treatment of a somewhat similar struggle in *Rain* or the inconsequential exposition of the faith healer in *The Miracle Man*. When we compare the play as published in 1909 in four acts with the revised version in three acts of 1910 we see how Moody relentlessly cut out the scene between Rhoda and Littlefield in which they wagered her future upon the success of Michaelis, and sacrificed apparent theatrical effectiveness for the higher climax of character. Had Moody written under the influence of the Scandinavian or Russian School, he would have produced tragedies which might have been faithful to fact, but Moody's dramas rise

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

above isolated facts to the higher realism of universal truth. Moody's themes drew their inspiration from a soil in which their roots could still be watered by idealism, and his plays are as American as they are modern. Moreover, when we view his work from *The Masque of Judgment* to *The Faith Healer*, we see that, consciously or unconsciously, his inherent dramatic genius was finding its path to complete expression.

To one of Moody's classes at Radcliffe College in 1895 came a girl, Josephine Preston Peabody, as a special student. Born in Brooklyn, New York, May 30, 1874, she grew up passionately devoted to the drama, reading plays when she could not see them and determined, notwithstanding the enforced narrowness of her early life, to conquer experience. What Moody's encouragement meant to her is revealed in her diary at this time and later,¹ for he remained a constant critic of her work.

She had published verse and short stories even before going to Radcliffe College, and in 1897 began her verse tragedy *Marlowe*. Even her lyrics show a tendency to become colloquy or monologue; as she said herself, "very few of the poems stand still." Prevented by straitened circumstances from frequenting the theatre, she made little pasteboard pieces for her characters and even for the stage directions, and worked with this scenic laboratory, shifting and planning, so that she might clarify the action and situations in her dramas. Her first published play, *Fortune and Men's Eyes* (1900), is a one-act verse drama, whose main characters are Shakespeare and Mary Fytton. It is based upon reading, of course, rather than upon life, but there is real beauty in the conception of spiritual passion on Shakespeare's part. *Marlowe* (1901) is a decided improvement. It is a five-act tragedy, in nervous, flexible blank verse, with a clarity that is gripping. Marlowe is idealized, but perhaps Miss Peabody drew him as his poet's imagination

¹ See *Diary and Letters of Josephine Preston Peabody*, esp. pp. 57-8, 128, and 234: "Oct. 17, 1910. On this strange day two died: two lights went out—one old and one young—my two cherished lights, Will Vaughn Moody and dearest Julia Ward Howe."

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

made him for a few lofty hours, and that, after all, is all the world cares for in its dead poets. Alison, the girl whom he loves and whom he visits, with mixed motives, after her marriage, is well drawn also. Moody, in a very sympathetic criticism of the drama,¹ calls Marlowe "A woman's Marlowe." This judgment is correct, but there is an unusual insight in the playwright's understanding of Marlowe's infatuation for a lady of the Court and his love for Alison, existing at the same time. Her creation of Richard Bame, the unsuccessful lover of Alison, from "the name appended to the historical 'Note of Marlowe's Atheistical Opinions,'" till he becomes a man obsessed by the idea of revenge for a "small spite" and so gives rise to the climax of the last Act, is worthy of attention. For it allows her to close Marlowe's career with some dignity, in defiance of facts known to her or to be discovered later. The idea of having Marlowe quarrel with Bame on Alison's account and veil his quarrel by a pretence that it is over a courtesan, is drama even if it is not history. Miss Peabody sent *Marlowe* to Mansfield only to have it returned unopened, and it was produced by amateurs at the opening of the theatre at Agassiz House, Radcliffe College, in 1905.

Miss Peabody was a lecturer on poetry at Wellesley College from 1901 to 1903, but resigned as she felt that her teaching interfered with her writing. In 1906 she was married to Lionel Marks, of the Engineering Faculty at Harvard University. In May, 1905, her one-act play, *The Wings*, was published, but it was not performed until 1912 when it was put on at the Toy Theatre in Boston. *The Wings* is laid in Northumbria about 700 A.D., and is concerned with a struggle between Cerdic, a priest, and Edburga, King Ælfric's mistress, for power over the King. The verse has her usual distinction, but the play, like her other efforts, is of interest chiefly as leading up to her masterpiece.

Her verse drama, *The Piper*, written in 1907, at the first instance for Otis Skinner, but not produced by him on account

¹ *Some Letters of William Vaughn Moody*, pp. 142-3.

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

of other plans, won the Stratford Prize Competition of three hundred pounds in March 1910. This prize, offered for the best play with which to inaugurate the new Shakespeare Memorial Theatre at Stratford-on-Avon, was open to universal competition, and three hundred and fifteen manuscripts were submitted. Mrs. Marks went to Stratford for the first production of the play, July 26, 1910, with Frank Benson as the Piper. Its success was repeated when it was played at the New Theatre in New York, January 30, 1911, with Edith Wynne Matthison in the leading part. Notwithstanding her successful interpretation, the part was written for a man and should have been acted by one.

The Piper is a triumphant vindication of the belief that true poetry is the source of the finest drama, that verse is no bar to effective stage representation, and that a dramatic artist must be free to choose his subject from any time or place. It strikes the universal note, the note of love which triumphs over hatred, over revenge, over selfishness, over the powers of evil.

The story of the Pied Piper of Hamelin is familiar, and is essentially dramatic. But to the old legend Mrs. Marks added incident and character fused by poetic vision. With a few deft touches she sketches the crass burghers of the Middle Ages who have been freed from the plague by the Piper, a strolling player, to whom they feel they need not keep their word because he is a social outcast. She draws well the attitude of the bourgeoisie toward the theatre, and the directness of action and language strikes us at the first scene, for the blank verse is natural dialogue, broken easily into flexible rhythms. The children's own love of music leads them naturally to the Piper and suggests to him that he charm them away. His action, therefore, has the spontaneity which is the life of drama in action or word.

One of the elements of greatness in *The Piper* lies in its artistic economy of motive. Mrs. Marks knew the Middle Ages by instinct as well as assimilated study. She sketches in a few but vivid lines the century-old struggle between the

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

power of Christianity and the power of the Devil—for to the Middle Ages charms and magic were the survivals of the old pagan worship, the old forces of pre-Christian, even pre-human life that must be conquered. Even the Piper is himself shaken by the power he wields—he charms the children to the old haunted “Hollow Hill” because he knows the burghers will not follow them there. When he finds out that as a sacrifice to bring back the children, the Burgomaster has been forced to give up his own daughter Barbara, and that the procession which is to lead her to a nunnery is to pass the lonely crossroads to Rudersheim, he charms the burghers, too, and makes them dance away to their own confusion while Barbara remains. The scene in which he releases Barbara from his charm so that his friend Michael may win her back to human love, is pure poetry. But the great climax of the drama comes at the end of the third Act, when Veronika, the mother of the little lame boy, Jan, scales the hills up to the lonely crossroads, where, under the figure of Christ, the “Lonely Man,” she fights for the body and soul of her little boy. The Piper is the incarnation of the artist, who believes he is saving the children from becoming like their fathers, stolid, selfish souls—in cages all their lives. Earlier in the play he has stated his hatred of oppression: “I’ll not have things in cages!” Perhaps the early struggles of the playwright herself found expression there. But when Veronika pleads with him, at first he is adamant, even when she tells him how, for her boy’s sake, she has sold herself to her second husband, Kurt the Syndic:

I meant, with my poor self, to buy him house
And warmth, and softness for his little feet.
Oh, then I knew not—when we sell our hearts,
We buy us nothing.

In a passionate speech she tells him that her love will draw her son back to her, and she leaves the Piper alone. Then follows the magnificent struggle between the Piper and the ideal of Christ, between the spirit of hate and revenge and that of

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

love and pardon, dramatic because it is a conflict between the soul of man and the power of God.

The Piper, alone, stands spell-bound, breathing hard, and looking after her. Then he turns his head and comes down, doggedly. Again he pauses. With a sudden sharp effort he turns, and crosses with passionate appeal to the shrine, his arm uplifted towards the carved Christ as if he warded off some accusation. His speech comes in a torrent.

Piper:

I will not, no I will not, Lonely Man!
I have them in my hand. I have them all—
All—all! And I have lived unto this day.
You understand. . . .

(He waits as if for some reply.)

You know what men they are.
And what have they to do with such as these?
Think of those old as death, in body and heart,
Hugging their wretched hoardings, in cold fear
Of moth and rust!—While these miraculous ones,
Like golden creatures made of sunset-cloud,
Go out forever,—every day, fade by
With music and wild stars!—Ah, but You know.
The hermit told me once, You loved them, too.
But I know more than he, how You must love them:
Their laughter, and their bubbling, skylark words
To cool Your heart. Oh, listen, Lonely Man!—

Oh, let me keep them! I will bring them to You,
Still nights, and breathless mornings; they shall touch
Your hands and feet with all their swarming hands,
Like showering petals warm on furrowed ground,—
All sweetness! They will make Thee whole again,
With love. Thou wilt look up and smile on us!

Why not? I know—the half —You will be saying.
You will be thinking of Your Mother.—Ah,
But she was different. She was not as they.
She was more like . . . this one, the wife of Kurt!
Of Kurt! No, no; ask me not this, not this!
Here is some dawn of day for Hamelin,—now!
’Tis hearts of men You want. Not mumbled prayers;

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Not greed and carven tombs, not misers' candles;
No offerings, more, from men that feed on men;
Eternal psalms and endless cruelties! . . .
Even from now, there may be hearts in Hamelin,
Once stabbed awake!

*(He pleads, defends, excuses passionately; before his
will gives way, as the arrow flies from the bow-string.)*

—I will not give them back!

And Jan,—for Jan, that little one, that dearest
To Thee and me, hark,—he is wonderful.
Ask it not of me. Thou dost know I cannot!

Look, Lonely Man! You shall have all of us
To wander the world over, where You stand
At all the crossways, and on lonely hills,—
Outside the churches, where the lost ones go!—
And the wayfaring men, and thieves and wolves
And lonely creatures, and the ones that sing!
We will show all men what we hear and see;
And we will make Thee lift Thy head, and smile.

No, no, I cannot give them all! No, no.—
Why wilt Thou ask it?—Let me keep but one.
No, no, I will not.

. *Have Thy way.—I will!*

Notice that the soliloquy is natural here and, on the stage, from the very first night, it stirred the audience profoundly. The return of the children is brought about artistically, and the Piper departs on his eternal quest.

In *The Wolf of Gubbio* (1913) Mrs. Marks dealt again with the struggle between love and greed in the heart of man. The medieval town, its people filled with their own importance and selfish interests, forms a background to the splendid humility of Saint Francis of Assisi. He charms the Wolf of Gubbio, long a terror to the village, until even the beast brings back the baby he has intended to devour. Mrs. Marks' dramatic power created a scene of tender beauty in the last act, when the woman who has been robbed and whose child has been

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

stolen, sits in the place of the Virgin in the Christmas spectacle, and the villagers bring her their best gifts while her heart is breaking. Mrs. Marks has interpreted well, too, the instinctive reaction to the influence of Saint Francis which turned the crass burghers of Gubbio, even if only for a time, into loving human beings. Neither *The Wolf of Gubbio*, nor her *Portrait of Mrs. W*—— (1922), a charming play based on the love of Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin, has been acted, though both were written with stage presentation in mind. Mrs. Marks departed from her usual choice of literary or historical material to treat real life in her comedy, *The Chamelcon* (1917), laid at the present day in a house out of town. The heroine, Honora Thorpe, continues to celebrate the individual's right to pursue her inclinations even if she breaks engagements, including that with the man she has promised to marry. Honora is a writer and so is the man she finally chooses, and there is some clever satire of temperamental instability and some charming love-making, even if the play does not soar to any such climax as *The Piper*. It reveals Mrs. Marks, however, as a skilful manipulator of the lighter shades of modern life.

The New Theatre provided an opportunity for another play of high quality in *The Arrow Maker*, by Mary Austin, which was produced February 28, 1911. It is one of the very few dramas in which the American Indian is adequately portrayed, not the stage Indian of tradition, but the real red man, idealized a bit for the purpose, but characterized into life. The theme is the revolt of the Chisera, or medicine woman of the Paiute tribe, against the very sanctity which keeps her remote from human love and tribal interests. She is placed on a pedestal in order that she may commune with the gods, but when she finds that the man whom she loves and whom she has made the war leader of the tribe has deserted her for the daughter of the chief, she denounces him in very human fashion, and leads the tribe herself against their enemies. Edith Wynne

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Matthison portrayed the Chisera with sympathy and distinction.

This note of repressed and insurgent desire for participation in life was expressed in Alice Brown's *Children of Earth*, a play with an interesting career. After the collapse of the New Theatre, its director, Winthrop Ames, offered a prize of \$10,000 for the best play to be submitted anonymously by an American. About seventeen hundred manuscripts were submitted. The jury of award, Augustus Thomas, Winthrop Ames and Adolph Klauber, gave the prize to *Children of Earth*, and the play was produced by Mr. Ames on January 12, 1915. It was not a stage success, although the characters are well drawn and there is drama in the central theme. Mary Ellen Barstow, a New England spinster, has been domineered over by her father and her brother Aaron, and when the former dies and the latter calmly informs her that she must live with him, she defies him and insists upon ordering her life at last. The lover of her youth returns, and she has built upon him an illusion of happiness which is shattered by the revelation of his meanness and cupidity. In despair she clutches at the offer of Peter Hale, whose wife Jane is a drunkard and a "Portygee," to elope with him. Then in a striking scene at morning in the woods, they see Jane, although she is heartbroken at their departure, going on to her daily tasks, and they decide to return. The play really ends here, and the fourth Act drags, even with Jane's brave effort to save their reputations. Miss Brown is a novelist rather than a playwright, although some of her one-act plays, like *Joint Owners in Spain*, have decided merit.

A play in which this note of individual protest is struck in a setting of an older fashion was the work of a young newspaper man of San Francisco, Charles Kenyon. *Kindling* opened in New York in December, 1911, failed to draw its public and was about to be withdrawn when it was saved by the efforts of a few fellow craftsmen who secured a new life for the play in Chicago. Through the efforts of the Drama League

MOODY AND THE DRAMA OF REVOLT

there it scored a success and went over the country.¹ The main theme is the right of everyone to have a fair start in life. Maggie Schultz is about to become a mother. She lives in terror of her child's future in the tenement district of New York, and in order to win their way to Wyoming and a healthier existence, she acts as a "fence" for a depraved thief who robs her own employers and benefactress. The economic background, however, is only incidental. What makes the play important is Maggie's remarkable plea, when she is discovered, for the right of her unborn child to have its chance. The vividness with which this scene lives in memory causes regret that Kenyon has produced nothing since of equal merit.

This group of dramatists does not by any means include all those who dealt with the revolt of the individual. They belong together in the history of our drama because they are nearly all men and women of letters who were brought into the theatre by the hope of achieving something fine and because they thought they saw a possibility in the quickening interest in the theatre which the new century seemed to inaugurate. It would be a mistake to ascribe the movement to any one institution, like the New Theatre, for, as a matter of fact, only two of the plays were produced there, but in a larger sense, the spirit of men like Winthrop Ames, its first director, or of actor-managers like Henry Miller, E. H. Sothorn or Margaret Anglin was responsible for the creation of a new atmosphere in which better drama could flourish. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that the three leaders in the new movement, Moody, Miss Peabody and Percy MacKaye, had to fight hard to obtain a footing, and their inspiration came from an unconquerable desire to create. Their mutual encouragement grew into close friendship, which included two other poets, Edwin Arlington Robinson and Ridgeley Torrance, both of whom wrote plays intended for the stage. Four of them studied at Harvard, but only two met there, for while Moody and Mac-

¹ See introduction to the published play for an interesting account of its salvation, illuminating in its revelation of the theatrical situation in 1911.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Kaye were there for one year together, they did not meet, and it was only after MacKaye's return from Europe that the relationship began. Their work antedates by some years the establishment of Professor Baker's course in playwriting in 1905, and it would be an error to overstress the Harvard influence. But it is highly significant that some of the finest drama of the Twentieth Century should owe its birth to college men and women who, in spite of untoward circumstances, produced practical stage plays which are permanent contributions to dramatic literature.

CHAPTER XIII

PERCY MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

ASSOCIATED with Moody not only in friendship and education, in the belief in the poetic drama, and, to a certain extent, in the drama of revolt, Percy MacKaye stands also for a quality of his own. This came to him from his father, Steele MacKaye, and while it has had different expressions, as we shall see, it may be epitomized as the desire to express dramatic ideas by means of large groups of actors, many of whom are but accessories to the main action, in short, the delight in the drama as a spectacle. This creation of emotion through mass and color and grouping has led to some striking achievements and has also placed a certain limitation upon his work, which will become apparent in a critical study.

Percy MacKaye comes from New England stock, mingled with Scottish ancestry on his father's side, and it may not be stretching a point too far to attribute his love of fantasy to his Celtic strain. His mother dramatized *Pride and Prejudice*, in a version long used in schools and colleges, and owing to his father's profession, Percy MacKaye grew up with the theatre. This association was interrupted by his stay at Harvard College, from which he graduated in 1897, some years before the "47 Workshop" of Professor Baker was established.

Before he entered Harvard he had written plays and had contributed choral songs to his father's drama of *Columbus*, which was to have been performed at the projected Spectorium in Chicago in 1893. The years 1898-1900 were spent in Italy and Germany, where he studied at Leipsic, and four years of school teaching in New York followed. During all this time he was continuing his dramatic work, and among the

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

unproduced plays a prose drama, *The Bridge Builder*, was upon a sociological theme, thus allying him to the drama of revolt. He had been writing, then, for ten years before his play, *The Canterbury Pilgrims*, was accepted by E. H. Sothern in 1903. Although Sothern did not produce it, he offered the author another commission, and, abandoning teaching, MacKaye settled at Cornish, New Hampshire, to devote himself to play writing.

The only play from his journeyman period to be printed was begun at Harvard in 1896. It is of interest as showing his early inspiration from Shakespeare and for the preface which was written in 1910, the date of its publication. In *A Garland to Sylvia* the poet dramatist mingles with his own creations in the effort to save his heroine, with whom he has fallen in love, from the villain lover. It is boyish fancy, and the indirectness of approach which is MacKaye's besetting sin is already apparent. More important is the preface which reveals how deliberate was the movement with which he and Moody became associated and how he separated himself at the beginning from the purely commercial aspects of the theatre.

As this independence has frequently resulted in the postponement of production, MacKaye's dramatic work can be studied most profitably, not from the chronological point of view but from a classification based upon both the material and the method of treatment. His plays intended for the regular theatre fall into one group, which in its turn presents different aspects. In the second, fall the community plays and in the third, the operas. Of real interest also are his critical works upon the theatre, including his prefaces to the published dramas.

His plays written in regular form include his imaginative treatment of older literary material, usually in blank verse, *The Canterbury Pilgrims*, *Fenris the Wolf*, *Jeanne d'Arc*, *Sappho and Phaon*, *A Thousand Years Ago* and *The Scarecrow*; his satiric or serious discussions of themes of contemporary interest in *Mater*, *Anti-Matrimony*, *Tomorrow*; and his

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

studies of provincial American life in *Yankee Fantasies*, *This Fine-Pretty World* and *Napoleon Crossing the Rockies*.

The Canterbury Pilgrims, written in 1902, though not produced by Sothorn, was performed by the Coburn Players in 1909 and has proved one of the most popular of his plays. In 1917 it became the libretto of an opera with music by Reginald de Koven. In *The Canterbury Pilgrims* Chaucer travels with his characters, and conducts quite delicately a sentimental episode with the Prioress while being pursued by the Wife of Bath. Richard II saves him at the end of the play by ruling that the Wife may be married for the sixth time, but only to a miller, and the miller takes her cheerfully. Any attempt to test such a play by its characterization, except in the cases of the principal parts, is forbidden by the luxuriance of the *dramatis personæ*. The Wife of Bath is obviously the most vivid as she is the most vigorous, and on the stage she became the leading figure. What we remember is the spectacle, the moving figures, the poetic conception that visualizes the Fourteenth Century even if it idealizes it. MacKaye had a real knowledge of Chaucer's language and times, and his conception of the poet as feeling at once a spiritual passion for the Prioress and a more earthly leaning toward the Wife of Bath shows an understanding of the qualities that have kept Chaucer's narratives alive through the centuries.

Fenris the Wolf, written in 1904, has not been performed. Its conception is dramatic, however, for it is based on the eternal reaction between masculine passion and feminine purity, and it contains some of the best poetry MacKaye has written. Perhaps the setting is too remote and there is the usual indirectness of approach. Fenris, the wolf god, strives to win Freya, who is betrothed to Baldur, his brother. Odin decides that all four shall be transformed into human beings, and he becomes Ingimund, a priest. Fenris is changed to Egil, a huntsman; Baldur, to Arfi, a dwarf; and Freya, to Thordis, daughter of Ingimund. Egil is a werewolf and in his struggle upward to a finer conception of love for Thordis, her instinc-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

tive response to the virility of his passion, his sweeping out of his path all obstacles, even the life of Arfi his brother, and his final height of sacrifice, MacKaye had a theme almost Titanic. But the ending seems inconclusive and the machinery of the gods' intervention interposes a barrier to our sympathy. Yet lines like those of Thordis:

A myriad loves the heart hath, but one mate.
Once only may the cry of soul and body
Be answered: the great need can be but once.

make us wish that MacKaye could always have written such direct and coherent verse.

Jeanne d'Arc, while written in 1905, was the first of his plays to be given professionally, being produced by Sothern and Marlowe at the Lyric Theatre in Philadelphia, October 15, 1906. MacKaye has drawn Jeanne as a simple Norman peasant, the symbol of a faith that could arm a Latin race to a supreme effort and a leader whom the descendants of a Celtic clan could follow to the death. The two problems that confront a playwright who treats the Joan of Arc story are, how to deal with the supernatural and how to provide a human interest which the career of Joan does not afford. MacKaye solved the first by bringing the voices into the play through Jeanne, especially in the fine climax of the second Act. The Dauphin is kneeling apparently at the feet of Jeanne; in reality he is seeing mirrored in her face the vision of St. Michael speaking through the stained glass figure of Charlemagne, who hails his descendant as legitimate, thus removing the doubt that clogged the actions of the Dauphin and paralyzed the loyalty of France. The human interest is strengthened by the character of D'Alençon, who loves Jeanne and whose scepticism makes her faith more apparent. It is a good touch to have his converted belief in her visions strengthen her in her hour of doubt in the prison. The temporary discouragement of Jeanne makes her more human, also, and D'Alençon expresses a profound truth when he says:



Photo by Dr. J. H. C. C. C.

Friendly yours - Reginald C. C. C.

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

For there's no pang, 'mongst all our mortal hurts,
Sharp as the vivisection of a dream.

MacKaye went to the original documents for his historic sources, and being in sympathy with medieval life and by nature hospitable to mystical interpretations, without which Jeanne d'Arc is unintelligible, he has given dramatic literature one of the best representations of her character and career. Jeanne d'Arc has become in literature almost as much a source of conflict as she was in real life, but there has seldom been so effective a treatment, one so free from the intrusion of modern theories or the distortion of personal bias, as that of MacKaye. Its reception on the stage was a triumph for both playwright and actors, and while Hauptmann's *Sunken Bell* and Sudermann's *John the Baptist* failed, the season was saved for Soth-ern and Marlowe by *Jeanne D'Arc*.¹

Sappho and Phaon, though it held the stage only seven days when it was produced in New York in 1907, is a powerful tragedy, lofty in conception and faithful to the Greek spirit. The tragedy proper tells the story of the love of Sappho for Phaon, a slave, a love which brings him to disaster and urges her to her fatal leap into the Ægean Sea. Human characters are brought into conflict with fate, typified by the gods, and if this makes the play remote for the average playgoer, it simplifies the action. Phaon kills his little son in mistake for his enemy; Thalassa, his wife, brings their baby, dead, into the temple for sacrifice; and no explanation is required except the anger of the gods. There is fine drama in the conflict between Thalassa and Sappho for the love of Phaon and the play builds up well to Sappho's self-destruction.

MacKaye presented *Sappho and Phaon* through a Prologue dealing with modern excavation at the site of Herculaneum, and an Induction, which places Horace and Virgil among the audience witnessing the tragedy, and paints with sympathy the relations of playwright and actor in the Roman theatre of

¹ See Russell, C. E. *Julia Marlowe, Her Life and Art*, pp. 416-20.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

their day. These are interesting to read, and, while they seem to be foreign to the spirit of the modern theatre, they cannot be blamed for the failure of the play, for they were not included in the actual performance. Other causes, possibly Bertha Kalich's intonation, which was not reminiscent of Greek, were responsible. But it is significant that the stage picture received the highest praise, especially the final scene, as Sappho apostrophizes Aphrodite before her plunge into the blue water, with the sun rising above the mist and casting a rose-colored glow upon her. It was again MacKaye's sense of the pictorial, of his vision of the beautiful in form and color translated into terms of the theatre, which proved his mastery of one phase of his art.

The same impulse, the desire to experiment in a dramatic form, accounts for the charming romantic fantasy, *A Thousand Years Ago* (1913). The theme was suggested by an Eighteenth Century Italian comedy, *Turandotte*, by Carlo Gozzi, translated into German by Friedrich Schiller, based originally upon a romance from the *Thousand and One Tales*. But the old story of the prince in disguise, who guesses the riddle and wins the princess, is not the important element in MacKaye's drama. It is rather the framework, in which Capocomico and his vagabond players from Italy become involved in the suit of the Prince of Astrakhan, and apparently extemporize their lines. The student of the theatre was thereby given an opportunity to observe the methods of Carlo Gozzi, whose plays belonged to the *Commedie dell' Arte Improvisata*, and seem to have been composed by him in his war against the realistic work of Goldoni. In Italy they were acted by masked and semi-masked players who extemporized to a certain degree, after having their parts explained to them. This machinery is better interwoven into the structure of the drama than is usually the case with MacKaye. *A Thousand Years Ago* is also of some significance in the romantic revival referred to elsewhere.

The Scarecrow, MacKaye's most significant contribution to

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

the regular stage, belongs to his earlier period through its poetic conception and background of fantasy, and through its inspiration in literature. It was begun in 1903 and has been revised constantly, even after production.¹ Its central idea was taken from Hawthorne's story of "Feathertop," published first in 1852 and afterwards included in *Mosses from an Old Manse*. MacKaye has added to the number of persons in "Feathertop." He has made Dickon, the evil spirit, concrete as the tutor of the Scarecrow, who is masquerading as Lord Ravensbane, in order to win the hand of Rachel Merton, the niece of Justice Merton. MacKaye has amplified a hint in "Feathertop" of a guilty relation between Justice Merton and Goody Rickby, into the revenge of the witch upon her betrayer by the deception which convinces the Justice that the scarecrow is his son. But most important, he has made Lord Ravensbane a more heroic and therefore a more tragic character, and as he states in his preface, he has substituted the element of human sympathy for that of irony.

MacKaye uses satire effectively in his picture of the Justice and the dignitaries of Harvard College in the late Seventeenth Century, deceived, by the cleverness of Dickon, into believing the Scarecrow is Lord Ravensbane. Dickon is a good stage character and some of his lines, such as his reply to his pupil, for whom he has penned a poem to Rachel, "Indeed, my lord, I flatter myself that I have dictated some of the finest lines in literature," reveal MacKaye's verbal dexterity. But what raises *The Scarecrow* above the usual play of the period is the powerful employment of the fantastic, not remote as MacKaye too often makes it, but an active force in the drama, kindling the rather abstract creations of Hawthorne into life by the clash of witchcraft against witchcraft in the climax of the drama, the end of the third Act. Here again, he takes a suggestion of Hawthorne, but intensifies its dramatic quality. Ravensbane, who has fallen in love with Rachel Merton, sees

¹"During and after its first production I altered it a good deal, resulting in the version as published in your *Representative American Plays*."—Letter from Mr. MacKaye, 1926.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

in the magic glass of truth, which Goody Rickby has sold Rachel, the figure of a scarecrow. At first he thinks it is some evil thing that has frightened Rachel and he draws his sword and rushes at it. Then he realizes that it is his own image, and in the bitter moment of his realization the soul of a man is born in him and baptized with his despair. It is a fine climax of character and the play does not fall down in its conclusion, for, spurred on by his love for Rachel, he flings aside at the last his pipe which keeps him alive and dies in order to rid the woman whom he loves of his presence. But as Rachel says in her requiem, he died a man, and the tragedy of the defeated soul leaves us not with a sense of futility, but with the exaltation that comes when we have witnessed a struggle that has been worth while.

The Scarecrow was first produced by the Harvard Dramatic Club, December 8, 1909; was given professionally with Frank Reicher as the Scarecrow, during two seasons, beginning January 17, 1911, and was played by Muriel Pratt at the Theatre Royal in Bristol, November 30, 1914. It was translated into French as *L'Épouvantail*, by Charles Marie Garnier in 1910, and into German as *Die Vogelscheuche* by Walther Fischer, and was produced at the Deutsches Theater in Berlin in August, 1914, under the direction of Max Reinhardt. The disturbed conditions of the time soon brought the play to a close. This foreign appreciation of the play is due partly to the universal motive, for while the scene is laid in Massachusetts, the drama really takes place in the outer limits of the human soul.

MacKaye's three attempts at the treatment of contemporary themes are included in the years 1908 to 1912. *Mater*, a comedy based on modern politics, is the weakest of his plays. Cullen, the boss, is unlike any politician in real life, and Michael, the hero, is too much of an idealist for the son of a Senator.

Much more successful is his satire upon the effect of the dramas of Ibsen, Hauptmann and Shaw upon the younger generation. The first two acts of *Anti-Matrimony* contain

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

some of the cleverest dialogue MacKaye has written, and the central situation is well conceived. Morris and Isabelle Grey have been married abroad, but in order to emancipate Morris's brother Elliott, and his wife Mildred, Isabelle's sister, the younger pair represent themselves, upon their arrival at the Grey homestead in Massachusetts, as unmarried. They are the apostles of freedom and the superman and anyone who has suffered from the pseudo-appreciation of the Scandinavian school of drama may have some delightful moments in reading the scenes in which Isabelle and Morris endeavor to educate their benighted relatives from the works of "the masters," which have been brought over in a suit-case. Mildred overhears a conversation between Isabelle and Morris which lets out their secret, and she and Elliott, by pretending that they are becoming emancipated and consequently by making love to their emancipators of the opposite sex, excite the jealousy of Isabelle and Morris and extort a confession of their respectability. While the play weakens toward the end, the directness of the language and the unity of structure are noteworthy and the tone of the play is like a breath of fresh air. It afforded Henrietta Crosman a congenial part in the rôle of Mildred.

This playful satire upon the absurdities which spring from the undigested influence of the continental dramatists, was more successful than MacKaye's serious attempt to treat one of their favorite themes. *Tomorrow*, which was given for a brief period at the Little Theatre in Philadelphia in 1913, dealt constructively with the problem of selection in matters of marriage, and was MacKaye's attempt at a positive treatment of a theme of which Ibsen in *Ghosts* and Brieux in *Damaged Goods* had furnished a negative aspect. If MacKaye failed to reach the standard set by Ibsen in the dramatic treatment of disease, he certainly excelled Brieux, for he at least wrote a play and not a tract. The idea of laying the scene in the garden of a botanist who has been studying the processes of grafting plants in order to develop similar processes among human beings was not a bad one, but there was too much discus-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

sion of eugenics and the type characters representing science and the church were not woven into the play with the skill that Moody showed in *The Faith Healer*.

MacKaye has well named his volume of one-act plays *Yankee Fantasies* (1912), for while the scene is native, there is no attempt at a realistic treatment of the material. The characters are types and those with which we are expected to sympathize appeal not on account of their fidelity to New England in racial characteristics, but rather because of their revolt from the dull routine of life or because of some alien strain in their blood. In *Chuck*, it is the kinship with the untamed animal that lends Abel his charm for Letty. In *The Antick*, the French blood in Julie, the "Canuck" girl, lures John Hale because of the unconscious inheritance from his own mother whom he believed to be of the New England stock, but whom he discovers was also of the proscribed race. This motive is essentially dramatic, and MacKaye might have made more of it. In *Gettysburg* the old soldier whose palsied legs come back to health at the sound of the martial music is a dramatic figure, for the intensification of memory until it produces a physical change provides adequate opportunity for acting. It seems a mistake, however, to have the soldier talk in blank verse. *Sam Average* has a larger theme, but one less suited to the theatre. During a scene in the War of 1812, in which two soldiers are preparing to desert, MacKaye symbolizes in the muffled figure that visits them the spirit of the average American who gives his best for the country he loves without outward expression but with quiet indomitable persistence. Again the conception is better than the execution, which is too abstract for the compass of a one-act play. These short dramas have had professional or semi-professional production, and yet they do not convince me that the one-act play is MacKaye's natural field. The necessary compression is alien to his whole habit of thought.

Along the same Appalachian Trail which harbors in New England the characters in the *Yankee Fantasies*, there lives, in

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

the Kentucky mountains, a primitive race which has already been treated in fiction. In 1920 a Fellowship in Creative Literature was established for MacKaye at Miami University, Ohio, near the Kentucky border, and he naturally seized the opportunity to study at first hand what seemed fine material for drama. The first fruit of his wandering and his sojourn among these people beyond the "hundred-mile wall of Pine Mountain" was the comedy, *This Fine-Pretty World*, performed at the Neighborhood Playhouse, New York, December 26, 1923.

In this play MacKaye has created a character. Beem Sprattling is a dreamer, called by his neighbors a "lie-swearer," who, according to his own account, "follies the Oninvisible and the Onbeheerd-of," combining with this imaginative quality a dishonest streak which has sent him to jail seventeen times. He is quite willing, for a shoat, to testify that he has had illicit relations with Mag Maggot, whose husband wishes to divorce her in order that he may marry a young girl. When their schemes are defeated, in one of the most amusing court trials on our stage, he declines to escape the penalty of his perjury, preferring jail, with its large leisure for dreaming, to the responsibilities of life. There is real comedy in character drawing and in situation, touched with a well-restrained sentiment which emerges in the silence of Beem Sprattling's wife, who declines to testify against him because he is "her man," and the chivalrous conduct of the judge who covers the courtroom with his gun in her behalf, as a tribute to her spirit of devotion. *This Fine-Pretty World* might have succeeded even better than it did had it not been for MacKaye's very faithfulness to his material. He became so charmed with the linguistic survivals of Elizabethan English which he found unspoiled or quaintly rearranged on the lips of the mountaineers, that for the first fifteen minutes the audience was barely able to follow the play. Dialect, after all, is in literature usually artificial, and on the stage it is a dangerous experiment unless a compromise is

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

effected between the real speech of the people represented and the normal language of the theatre.

While *The Scarecrow* remains still his best play for the regular theatre, it is in the field of the "community drama" that MacKaye has probably done his most original work. From the early days of his association with his father, he has conceived of the drama as a social force, and the crusading spirit which has been an inspiration and also, at times, an interference with his artistic career, shows most clearly in his plays written for the community theatre. MacKaye is distinctly American in his conception of the community as a creative assisting force as well as an audience. To him the people are not "toilers," as they so frequently appear in the European folk drama; there is no class consciousness implied; they are united in a democratic art which does not need to assert equality, because its converse has not been suggested.

From 1905, when his Prologue to the *St. Gaudens Masque* was produced at Cornish, New Hampshire, he has been experimenting with the masque as a flexible form in the theatre. His *Canterbury Pilgrims* was given with fifteen hundred citizens of Gloucester, Massachusetts, in 1909, as *The Gloucester Pageant*, in honor of President Taft. *Sanctuary, a Bird Masque*, in which the conversion of a bird hunter is brought about by both symbolic and natural characters, was given first at Meriden, New Hampshire, September 12, 1913, in honor of President and Mrs. Wilson, to dedicate the bird sanctuary of the Meriden Bird Club. It has been repeated many times and has carried its message of humanity to a quarter of a million spectators. In 1914 he conceived and directed a civic masque concerned with the development of the city of Saint Louis from its foundation through the work of Spanish, French and English pioneers, including the conquest of gold. This masque had a real civic purpose apart from its artistic aim, and its importance as a union of social and artistic forces is rightly emphasized by MacKaye in the published play.

Caliban, by the Yellow Sands, a Community Masque of the

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

Art of the Theatre, was executed by MacKaye at the invitation of the committee which had in charge the celebration, in New York City, of the Terecentenary of Shakespeare's death. It was given on a great scale at the stadium of the College of the City of New York from May 25 to June 5, 1916, with about twenty-five hundred persons in the production, and with the help of artists like Joseph Urban and Robert Edmond Jones, and of organizations such as the Neighborhood Playhouse and the Washington Square Players. The music was by Arthur Farwell. It was truly a fine example of individual and community co-operation, and the result was magnificent. Mere size means nothing in itself, but there is a nobility in the unification of masses of human beings expressing one artistic conception of beauty, in celebration of a lofty theme. And for the creation and direction of *Caliban* the chief credit belongs to Percy MacKaye.

The inspiration of the masque was naturally some phase of Shakespeare's art. MacKaye chose to continue the theme of *The Tempest* and adapt it to a celebration of the art of which Shakespeare is the foremost exponent. Caliban is regenerated through two forces, his love for Miranda and his education by Prospero. According to MacKaye, "Caliban is that passionate child-curious part of us all, grovelling close to his aboriginal origins, yet groping up and staggering . . . toward that serener plane of pity and love, reason and disciplined will, where Miranda and Prospero commune with Ariel and his spirits."

On a raised stage, the great jaws of Setebos hold the form of Ariel imprisoned, while Caliban jeers at him. Then Miranda appears and Prospero frees Ariel and saves Miranda from Caliban's lust. But instead of spurning him as a brute, Prospero determines to educate him by a revelation of the progress of dramatic art. This is expressed in two ways. In the large central ground-circle, pageant groups represent typical dramatic spectacles of ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome, of medieval Germany, France, England, Spain and Italy. It is not

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

too much to say that these spectacles were a revelation to modern eyes of the varying forms of dramatic creation, a protest against the canons of criticism that limit the art of the theatre by preconceived theories.

On an elevated inner stage there were enacted scenes from Shakespeare's plays. These were not so successful, for distance rendered them inaudible to nearly all the spectators, and they seemed less closely woven into the texture of the masque. But *Caliban* must be judged by its total effect, and, despite certain weaknesses which were inherent in any such production, the final picture of Caliban regenerated, rising from his stooping position to his height and calling to the spirit of Shakespeare for "More visions,—visions, Master," is unforgettable.

There is a distinction between the impression made upon a community through the effect of a masque upon its material progress and the impression made upon large groups of people by the masque which develops an artistic theme for an occasion of civic interest which has no local relation. Naturally, the universal has more quality of permanence than the particular, and that is why *Caliban* is of more significance than *Saint Louis*. *Saint Louis* could be given only in one time and place; *Caliban* could be given in any place in which Shakespeare's art is known, and indeed it was repeated in Boston with twice the personnel and before even larger crowds.

From the point of view of poetic expression, *The Evergreen Tree* (1917), a masque of Christmas, is one of MacKaye's most appealing productions. One after another, the persons connected with the Christmas story pass before the tree or are sheltered under it. Human interest is won by making Herod's slaughter of the children concrete in the story of the wounded peddler, Claus, and by a not too fanciful transition, he becomes the prototype of Santa Claus, the patron of the tree and of Christmas.

A drama which MacKaye classifies among his plays for the regular theatre, but which is also allied to his more spectacular

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

dramas is *Washington, the Man Who Made Us*, first produced as a whole at the Belasco Theatre in Washington, before Congress and members of the Cabinet on February 22, 1920, with Walter Hampden as Washington. MacKaye calls it a "ballad play" and it is one of his brave attempts to develop a folk drama out of present-day conditions of the traditional theatre. *Saint Louis* and *Caliban* proceed symbolically. *Washington* deals with real events. So did the early chronicle plays, of course, but the progressive aspect of *Washington* is the attempt to develop a "participatory technique," both for indoors and for out-of-doors. By this is meant a technique which permits the performance of the play by a large number of actors who thereby express the spirit of the community producing the drama, and which allows also its production on a scale suited for the traditional theatre. MacKaye has expressed clearly the distinction between the two objects for which he strives:

The basic requirement of the Community Drama is expression—expression varied to its maximum to include expressional opportunity for the largest number of individual participants practicable.

The basic requirement of the commercial theatre is just the opposite—expression concentrated to its minimum, to include only the kind of expressional opportunity, within range of the fewest needful actors, and proportioned to their salaries for competence or reputation.

.

For community necessities the play should have the maximum number of characters, with maximum opportunity for expression: for commercial necessities—the minimum of these.¹

MacKaye tried to solve this problem by providing two forms of the play; one festal, with one hundred characters, and one in which the rôles may be taken by twenty-nine persons.

MacKaye has faced the usual difficulties of the chronicle play. He has attempted to portray Washington as a young

¹ Appendix to *Washington, the Man Who Made Us*, pp. 288-89.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

man, at Mt. Vernon; in the conflict of the Revolution, and in his return to private life. He has conceived of him in his human and national relations. He has gone even farther and has represented him as a world figure, receiving the homage of the Allies. For such a drama, unity is almost impossible, but MacKaye endeavored to tie the episodes together by a series of ballads, based on old tunes traditional in New England or the Southern Appalachian Mountains. The words are at times traditional and sometimes original with MacKaye. The sole test of such an innovation is its success with an audience; but in reading, the ballads seem interruptions. Moreover, the whole play is not fused, and the very wealth of material, lofty in conception though it is, and based on a thorough study of Washington's character, defeats the purpose of the playwright. Perhaps, after all, the expert playwrights of the past, like Dunlap or Burnett, were wise in keeping Washington in the background. Certainly the many plays in which he figured as the chief character, and which have all perished, would seem to attest their wisdom. Washington is really too great a figure for the stage. He is too well-known in his actions, too little really understood in his nature. Having become a great national ideal, it is a mistake to depict him realistically. To paint him as an ideal character against a background of realistic scenes and characters is confusing.

MacKaye attempted another compromise by providing a chronicle play which could be produced either in its entirety or in separate episodes. This is a fatal compromise from the point of view of unity. But there are a number of the episodes that in themselves are quite effective. Indeed, the Valley Forge Episode, in Act III, was given in French by Jacques Copeau, at the Théâtre du Vieux Colombier in New York during the week of February 17, 1919, before the entire play was produced in Washington, while other actions have since been published for production as one-act plays.

The operas fall outside our province. *Rip Van Winkle*

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

(1919) is of interest, however, as a laudable attempt at an opera upon a native theme, in which words and music, the latter by Reginald de Koven, should both be the work of Americans. Rip is represented in his youth and a love motive is created by the invention of Peterkee, a child who later becomes his wife. There is a sympathetic interpretation of Rip Van Winkle as the representation of eternal youth, and the effect on the stage was charming within its limitations.

Not only in his play writing, but also in his critical essays, MacKaye has been a crusader for the gospel of democracy in the drama and for the development of the theatre as a force toward the kindling of a higher social consciousness. In *The Playhouse and the Play* (1909), *The Civic Theatre* (1912) and *Community Drama* (1917) he has argued for an endowed civic theatre as the only escape from the limitations which commercialism has set to the free exercise of the playwright's skill. He recognizes that a private business must pay, and he believes that managers will tend toward the production of the well-established forms of drama rather than toward the encouragement of original ideas. He shares, too, with Moody the revolt against the spirit of Puritanism in an eloquent passage:

But that same oblique-eyed spirit which broke the beautiful idols of fauns and Grecian deities, and smashed the images of stained-glass saints, long since looked upon the living images of the playhouse with suspicion, and shattered the earlier ideals of play and players with contempt. The iconoclast and the Puritan combined to close the doors of the playhouse as a public temple of the joy of life; and over its doors, suspended, they placed Satan, with Miltonian wings, to shed darkness on the drama, obscuring its religious function from the people. And so to day, though the Puritan has departed and Satan has lost his anathema, and though the people once more flock back in multitudes to the playhouse, yet they no longer enter it as a public temple; new generations have forgotten that ever it was one, for they find it occupied by private merchants; and the joy of life which they view there is no longer dedicated to their common aspiration.¹

¹ *The Playhouse and the Play*, p. 74.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

It may well be that MacKaye's greatest service to the American drama will be that of inspiration. He grew up in the theatre and his knowledge of its history and technique is beyond question. His experiments in the traditional theatre, in the community out-of-door masque, as well as his constant writing upon the theatre, have undoubtedly helped to bring about the widespread revolt against the domination of the commercial standards in theatre and drama. From the beginning of his career he has stood resolutely, in the face of what must have been to a young man great temptation, against the lowering of his artistic ideals to the claims of personal vanity on the part of actors or managers who wished to alter his plays to suit themselves. For this courage and this devotion to his art there can be nothing but praise, and if for a long time he seemed a voice crying in the wilderness, he is entitled to the credit of the pioneer. Many of his dreams seem impossible of fulfillment, and the impracticability of some of them has obscured, perhaps, the essentially sound basis of others of more vital significance.

To a certain degree the result is the same with his dramas. With all his scrupulous care in the gathering of material to represent Greece, Italy or England of an older time, we feel that in the creation of atmosphere, life somehow has escaped. Nearly all his inspiration comes from history or literature—when he deals with real life, as in *Mater*, he has done his weakest work. With insight into the dramatic qualities of the characters of Chaucer or of Hawthorne, of historical personages like Joan of Arc, he has given us no character that is wholly his. This would not matter so much, for he has the best authority in the history of the drama for this appropriation, if we did not feel that the conception was greater than the execution. And so lofty has been his framework that mediocrity, even at times triviality in his language, jars more severely than it would in the work of a playwright less ambitious. Yet when his limitations have been mentioned, it is with regret. For the spiritual imagination that conceived the agony of the

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

Scarecrow, tortured with the birth pangs of a human soul, looked into the future of the drama of fantasy. And the visual power that conceived of *Caliban*, with its hundreds of actors moving harmoniously into a unity that brought the art of the theatre of the world into one great spectacle, looked far into the future of the theatre of the people.

Sympathetic as my interest is in this drama of the people, its nature forbids any treatment here, and I can only indicate its scope by a few illustrations which show the distinction between it and the traditional drama. The community drama, in fact, has not yet been defined, for it is still in an experimental stage. In its pure state it is a departure from the traditional theatre, for it is the expression by a group of people of a dramatic theme in which they are not merely repeating words written by one playwright, but are adding elements in action and characterization wrought out of their own interest in the occasion. In its extreme form the play should be composed by the group and directed by them; the costumes should be made, the setting devised and the lighting designed by the participants. This pure form of the community drama is far from being generally practicable and, as a matter of necessity, the community drama has had to be evolved by a few artists working harmoniously in their respective spheres. Most important is the force which directs the spectacle and ties together the various elements into unity. On account of the large scale on which some community plays are given, the question of acoustics is an insistent one, and in certain phases of the community drama pantomime has to be substituted for the spoken word. Music, as an accompaniment of pantomime, or of the word itself, is often a vital adjunct.

The most noteworthy of our masques or pageants have been inspired by a desire to celebrate a great historical personage or to preserve a picture of a period in our history. The *Mission Play*, which recreates the story of the founding of Christian civilization in the West, was produced for the first time April 29, 1912, at the Mission Play Theatre, San Gabriel, Cali-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

foria, and has been given each season since then. The conception of the play was due to John Steven McGroarty (1862-), the historian of California. The *Mission Play* is especially interesting because it is centred, more than is usually the case, about a character, that of Fra Junipero Serra. The first Act reveals him in 1769 at San Diego, holding by his indomitable spirit the first settlement at San Gabriel which is just about to be abandoned when the relief ship arrives. The struggle of Fra Serra against the despair of starving men, against the unresponding Indians, against even the priests of his company who have begun to give up hope, makes fine drama. The second Act portrays the missions in their prime in 1784, and reveals Fra Serra's great love for California. The author rediscovered in 1923 the old Santo, a hymn which had not been sung for eighty years and which now forms part of the musical accompaniment of the drama. One of the most striking elements in the play is the part taken by descendants of the old Spanish and Mexican families who sing the songs and dance the dances of their forefathers. The third Act depicts the decay of the missions in 1847 after their seizure by the Mexican Government, and the play ends with the illumination of the cross that stands upon the hillside above Capistrano. It is estimated that over two million spectators have seen the *Mission Play* and it has become an institution of California, built up from her soil and with a wide social influence.

Another California production, *The Pilgrimage Play*, was first produced June 28, 1920, and each year it is presented nightly during the summer months, Sundays excepted, in the open air Pilgrimage Theatre set against the hills in the El Camino Real Canyon in Hollywood. *The Pilgrimage Play* was largely the work of the late Christine Wetherill Stevenson, of Philadelphia, who has accomplished a remarkable feat in transcribing the Biblical story of the earthly career of Jesus Christ as found in the Four Gospels, so as to reproduce the language of Christ without impairing the dramatic form. The

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

basis of the play is the King James version of the English Bible, and there are only a few instances where the simpler language of other versions has been substituted. The play is presented in twelve episodes or scenes, with a prologue in which the coming of Jesus is heralded, and to which is added an epilogue of promise.

The first scene deals with the career of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus Christ. The second scene is in Samaria and the miracles are wrought. The third is at the court of Herod and dramatizes the incident of Salome. The fourth is the Transfiguration. The fifth is at the house of Martha in Bethany and deals with the resurrection of Lazarus. These scenes make up the first Act.

The second Act is laid in Jerusalem and proceeds with the dramatic incidents of Christ's Passion—the defiance of the authority of the Jews, the Last Supper, the Garden of Gethsemane, a trial scene before Caiaphas and again before Pilate, the scene at the tomb, and finally the brief scene of the Ascension. The setting was very well employed in the production of a dramatic atmosphere. While the Crucifixion was not represented on the stage, the three crosses on the distant hills were illuminated as the final touch of drama. The part of Jesus of Nazareth has been played by many well-known actors, including William Faversham, Henry Herbert, Reginald Pole, and Ernest Lawford. Reginald Pole has directed the production each season.

Far across the continent, a companion piece to the *Mission Play* was *The Pilgrim Spirit*, the pageant given in celebration of the Tercentenary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620. It was first produced July 13, 1921, and was repeated during the summer. The author and director was Professor George Pierce Baker and the participants included the people of Plymouth and the surrounding towns. After preliminary episodes describing the earlier attempts at settlement the persecution which drove the separatists out of England is portrayed in a number of scenes. Later episodes show

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the Pilgrims in Holland, the signing of the Mayflower Compact on shipboard, the landing, the struggles with the Indians, the disputes among the Colonists; and strike some notes of prophecy. The pageant was very effective and was more than a local undertaking since songs were written for it by Edwin Arlington Robinson, Josephine Preston Peabody and Robert Frost. It is significant that the three most striking pageants of the time, *The Mission Play*, *The Pilgrimage Play* and *The Pilgrim Spirit*, have all celebrated the power of faith and the triumph of the spirit even in apparent defeat.

Only a word can be said concerning the many masques and pageants produced by the colleges. Perhaps the most truly dramatic was the *Masque of American Drama*, produced by the Zelosophic and Philomathean Societies of the University of Pennsylvania in May, 1917, as part of the American Drama celebration, under the auspices of the Drama League of America. This came appropriately one hundred and fifty years after the production of the first American play, Thomas Godfrey's *The Prince of Parthia*. The *Masque* was inspired by MacKaye's *Caliban* and in a sense began where that finished. It represented the courtship of Drama by America, and the interruptions and discouragements, due to wars, commercialism and other impediments, of the development of the art of drama in this country, before its final triumph. The words of the *Masque* were written by Albert E. Trombly of the Faculty of Romance Languages, and the music by Reginald de Koven. Practically all the parts were taken by the students of the University. The symbolic characters acted on a front stage; the historical processions and dances took place in a middle ground and, on a rear stage, scenes from five American plays representing the progress of the art, were played in pantomime with musical accompaniment. The plays selected were Godfrey's *Prince of Parthia*, Bird's *Gladiator*, Boker's *Francesca da Rimini*, Rip Van Winkle, and MacKaye's *Scarecrow*. One effective episode was the representation of Thomas Godfrey

MACKAYE AND THE DRAMA AS SPECTACLE

explaining the meaning of his play to his fellows in the old College of Philadelphia.

These few instances of the community spectacle can only indicate the widespread possibilities of the art. But after all, it is not drama in the sense that the folk play as written in North Carolina¹ under Professor Koch's direction is drama. What separates the community play from the traditional drama most sharply is its lack of characterization. The progress of the drama has steadily been away from the play in which large room was needed for the display of turbulent emotion. The picture-frame stage has come with the intimate drama, with the play which appeals through slight gesture and pregnant sentences that make their insistent demand upon the quick appreciation of the audience. It has seemed to modern playwrights, as it has seemed to all the great dramatists of the past, that the word must carry with it its instant appeal, and that the most vital plays are those in which what the character says and does dominates both situation and background.

Community dramas have been written for a quarter of a century. Yet from them how many characters remain in our memories? Is not the reason that after all the discussion of the subject belongs in the history of the theatre, not in the history of the drama? For the theatre it is of great significance; for the drama that is to become a permanent literary inheritance it is still of interest mainly when it forms a portion of the work of a playwright who has proved himself in the regular form.

¹ See Chap. XXIII.

CHAPTER XIV

RACHEL CROTHERS AND THE FEMININE CRITICISM OF LIFE

IT WAS only to be expected that the new spirit in drama would find its expression from the point of view of a woman. During the latter part of the Nineteenth Century, few women had followed the example of Mrs. Mowatt and Mrs. Howe, and those who did, like Marguerite Merington, the author of *Captain Lettarblair*, Madeleine Lucette Ryley, author of *An American Citizen*, or Martha Morton, who wrote a number of stage successes, including *A Bachelor's Romance*, need not detain us. They were usually romantic or farcical comedies and merely followed a mode of the time.

The work of Rachel Crothers, on the contrary, had from the beginning a quality of its own. Like Moody's, her plays have usually been a criticism of life, but unlike Moody she came to the drama not through the avenues of literature but through the definite training of the stage. She is, above all, a practical playwright, with a keen sense of what is theatrically effective. She directs her own plays and, with a feminine instinct for detail, presents a stage setting in which there is rarely a jarring note. Yet she has steadily declined to be merely entertaining, and in consequence her plays form a body of drama whose significance grows under inspection and whose unity of purpose becomes steadily more apparent.

Rachel Crothers was born in Bloomington, Illinois, in 1878. She is the daughter of Dr. Eli Kirk Crothers, a friend of Lincoln, who won the only lawsuit to which her father was a party, and Marie Louise DePew, who was the first woman physician in the central part of Illinois. Her grandfather, Elijah De Pew, was also a friend of Lincoln and promoted his Presidential



Rachel Roberts

RACHEL CROTHERS

campaign. Against the traditions of her family, she developed a passion for the theatre as a child, and wrote and directed a play at the age of twelve. After graduating from the State Normal School in 1892, she began her training for the stage in Boston and in New York, principally at the Wheateroft School, remaining as pupil and instructor for four years. She also filled three engagements on the professional stage, with Madame Rhea and others.

During her stay at the Wheateroft School Miss Crothers began her creative work with the writing and directing of one-act plays, and her first work to be professionally performed was a one-act comedy, *The Rector*, presented at the Madison Square Theatre in 1902. This is a treatment, with real insight, of a young clergyman who marries a pretty but not very practical girl, instead of the wife selected for him by his congregation. Her first long play, *The Three of Us* (1906), was laid in a mining camp in Nevada. If it is not as profound a study of the contrasted Eastern and Western types as Moody gave us the same year in *The Great Divide*, it is a vivid and sympathetic presentation of a girl's character. Rhy MacChesney's determination to guide and protect her two younger brothers, even against their own ambitions and even at the risk of her own happiness, is appealing because it is carried out without heroics and because it celebrates the loyalty of thousands of women who, in the United States, play the dual rôle of sister and mother. But Rhy is not simply the self-immolating woman of European drama: she is also the head of the family and a woman of business. She is an active force, and when she has been put in a false position by giving her word to a clever schemer not to reveal certain information, she goes to his rooms at night and demands release from her promise. Much of the plot is conventional, it is true, but the characters are well drawn, and the preservation of the family of the MacChesneys kindles a responsive chord in anyone who sympathizes with youth fighting its battles against the world and its own inexperience.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

The *Coming of Mrs. Patrick* (1907) and *Myself Bettina* (1908) showed no advance upon *The Three of Us*, but in her next play, *A Man's World* (1909), Miss Crothers produced one of the most significant dramas of the decade. With a few deft touches she establishes the atmosphere of a boarding house in lower New York. Around "Frank" Ware, a writer who is a woman of an independent but lovable nature, she places a well-drawn group of painters, writers and musicians, of whom Fritz Bahn, a violinist, Lione Brune, a singer, and Clara Oakes, a hapless miniature painter, are the most important. Frank Ware is bringing up "Kiddie," a boy of seven, whose mother had died in her house in Paris when the boy was born. Through her sympathy with this woman in her shame, Frank has become convinced that any scheme of things which permits the father of "Kiddie" to escape the consequences of his action is basically not fair, even if society has accepted the "double standard" of morality. So embittered is she that she fights against her growing love for Malcolm Gaskell, a vigorous personality who, unknown to himself and to her, is "Kiddie's" father. Miss Crothers's skill is shown in the way she makes every stroke count. In the second Act, laid in Clara's rooms, Lione, jealous of Fritz Bahn's love for Frank, points out in Clara's miniature of Kiddie his strong resemblance to Gaskell. It is a fine scene, in which is depicted the crystallization of rumor into suspicion. Moreover, Clara, the medium through which it is built up, is herself one of the best characters in the drama, and her outburst of grief at the failure of her pitiful exhibition and the uselessness of her life is truly pathetic, and made a deep impression on the stage.

Clara: No man has ever asked me to marry him. I've never had a beau—a real beau—in my life. I—I've always been superfluous and plain. Absolutely superfluous. I'm not necessary to one single human being. I'm just one of those everlasting women that the world is full of. There's nobody to take care of me and I'm simply not capable of taking care of myself. I've tried—God knows I've tried—and what is

RACHEL CROTHERS

the use? What under Heaven do I get out of it? If I were a man—the most insignificant little runt of a man—I could persuade some woman to marry me—and could have a home and children and hustle for my living—and life would mean something. Oh, I can't bear it, Frank. I can't bear it! I often wish I were pretty and bad and could have my fling and die.

(Sobbing she falls on the couch—huddled and helpless.)

The height of the action comes in the third Act in two strong scenes. Lione tells Frank her belief in Gaskell's relation to Kiddie, and in the conversation of the two women Lione puts the conventional attitude clearly: "It's a man's world—that's the size of it. What's the use of knocking your head against things you can't change?" But Frank has a higher standard, and when Gaskell comes in to tell her he loves her, she questions him and finds he is really Kiddie's father. Skilfully Miss Crothers shifts the appeal from the general to the personal. Frank has been willing to love Gaskell without inquiring into his past. But when she finds out the truth she recoils.

Frank: Every time I've looked at Kiddie I've cursed the man who ruined his mother and branded him with disgrace.

Gaskell: Frank, stop!

Frank: I've loathed and despised that man, I tell you—and it's you. Before it was some one else—anyone—some one unknown, but now it's you—you—you.

(She stops. They both turn with horror, as Kiddie, in his night clothes, stands watching them, a little wondering figure.)

Frank refuses to marry him, for she cannot make him see that he has committed any crime. To him, Kiddie's mother was an incident, and he runs true to form, being too honest to pretend to a remorse he does not feel. Miss Crothers had the courage to end her play logically, for Frank had been in love with an ideal of Gaskell rather than with Gaskell himself. *A*

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Man's World offers no solution for the situation it deplors, except the substitution of a career for a woman instead of the dependence upon marriage as her only resource. There is no railing at mankind, however, and it challenged Augustus Thomas' more profound analysis in his best play, *As a Man Thinks*, in which he definitely refers to *A Man's World*. It was not only her knowledge of feminine psychology that made the play important. When Fritz Bahn tells Lione, "Every woman keeps her own place in a man's heart," we realize that Miss Crothers knows both sides of the shield.

In *He and She*, first played on the road in 1911 and then produced in Boston as *The Herfords* in 1912, Miss Crothers dealt with a situation both modern and fundamental, the contest of husband and wife for supremacy and for the establishment of their respective spheres. Tom Herford and his wife Ann are both sculptors and have succeeded in keeping their professional and personal relations distinct until both enter an important competition. Her quick sympathy when she knows he has lost is sharply contrasted with his reaction when they learn a few moments later that Ann has won. He struggles bravely to rejoice with her, but he feels instinctively that her victory has brought about a crisis in their relations. Among the group gathered at their home to wait for the verdict, her father, his sister, and his assistant, Keith McKenzie, all show their disappointment, while the only one to rejoice is Ruth Creel, a representative of the girl who prefers her own career as an editor to the domination of the love of Keith. Then into this tense situation Millicent, the sixteen-year-old daughter of Tom and Ann, precipitates her love story with the chauffeur at her boarding school. This scene, in which Ann, with her heart full of the struggle between love and ambition, has to fight with all her skill to draw from Millicent the truth about her relations with the boy, is as quietly dramatic as anything Miss Crothers has done. Ann gives up her opportunity, although Tom tells her what will happen.

RACHEL CROTHERS

Tom: You're cut up now—but if you should give this thing up—there'll be times when you'd eat your heart out to be at work on it—when the artist in you will *yell* to be let out.

Ann: I know. I know. And I'll hate you because you're doing it—and I'll hate myself because I gave it up—and I'll almost—hate—her. I—I know. I know. You needn't tell me. Why, I've seen my men and women up there—their strong limbs stretched—their hair blown back. I've seen the crowd looking up—I've heard people say—"A woman did that" and my heart has almost burst with pride—not so much that *I* had done it—but for *all* women. And then the door opened—and Millicent came in. There isn't any choice, Tom—she's part of my body—part of my soul. Will you make my frieze, dear, will you?

Miss Crothers reveals so sympathetically the man's point of view—that he must be the breadwinner and the head of the family, that the play on the stage secures the sympathy for Tom rather than Ann. It was written for a woman star but, although it has been produced on four different occasions, the last time in 1920, with Miss Crothers acting the part of Ann, it has not been a popular success. Yet the dialogue is as fine as any she has written and her differentiation of the women like Ann and Ruth, as opposed to the domestic old-fashioned type like Daisy Herford, who frankly wants to be married, is complete. Perhaps the play is even yet ahead of its time, for the situation on which it is based does not occur as frequently as it undoubtedly will in the future. It was based, however, on an actual situation, in which the husband and wife were both skilled architects.

Ourselves (1913) is a powerful study of the responsibility which women of cultivation and refinement should assume for present moral conditions. Beatrice Barrington takes Molly from a reformatory into her own home and Molly develops an affair with Bob Barrington, Beatrice's brother. Molly delivers a curtain speech as she leaves the house of her benefactress:

Molly: I'm goin' fast enough. I didn't ask to come. Lord knows I didn't want to. I don't know what you call good and

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

bad—the way you see it—all I want is to get out. You happen to find out one little thing and act like this when it's too late. Are you blind as bats? Don't you live in this world? Don't you know what is goin' on? If you feel like this about it, why don't you stop it? If this is the worst thing your men can do why do you let 'em? Why do you stand fer it and—and there wouldn't be any of us.

Young Wisdom (1914) is a comedy dealing with an attempt at a trial marriage and the triumph of convention. In the same year she showed her versatility by writing a charming romantic comedy, *The Heart of Paddy Whack*, laid in Ireland about 1790. While the plot was conventional, Miss Crothers revealed her understanding of the imaginative quality in the Irish peasant, especially in the character of the boy Michael. In *Old Lady 31* (1916) she took as a basis a novel by Louise Forsslund but enriched it by her additions. It is an appealing story of an old sea captain and his wife, who, through poor investments on his part, are brought to poverty. Rather than separate he secures admission to the Old Ladies' Home to which he has taken her and he becomes "Old Lady 31." The reaction of the women in the home, his rebellion and final capitulation and return, are dextrously managed to preserve the mellow fragrance of love in the twilight of two simple but gallant lives.

Miss Crothers's work was interrupted by her services as founder and president of the Stage Women's War Relief. But after a play, *Once Upon a Time*, hastily written for Chauncey Olcott and laid in a copper district in the Far West and in New York City, Miss Crothers wrote her striking comedy, *A Little Journey* (1918). It was not so much the unusual stage setting of the Pullman car, for that had been used before, but it was the natural way she made the various characters react to the situations. Julie Rutherford, a girl who has been brought up in luxury but is suddenly left with no alternative except a life with a distant brother who does not want her, loses her ticket and has to accept the help of Jim West, a

RACHEL CROTHERS

Western type, who is much more real than the conventional cowboy so long in possession of the stage. Their rapidly growing love story is set against an amusing background of the various types which throng a sleeping car. The contrast of the first Act, with the characters' instinctive distrust of each other, and the second Act, with its note of temporary intimacy, is wrought in the spirit of true comedy. Then comes the sudden crash of an accident, and the lights go out. The third Act, on the hill top, in which the real natures of the characters emerge under stress, is a fitting conclusion. They do not all become heroic by any means, but the transition in Julie's nature is at least possible, and the assumption of half the group that the blow on her head has injured her reason is one of Miss Crothers' sure touches. In fact, the very skill with which the minor characters are drawn threatens to dwarf the interest of the main action, and this dramatic danger became more apparent in *39 East* (1919), in which one remembers much more clearly the boarding-house types than one does the love story which is intended to be the central motive.

After twenty years of playwriting, Miss Crothers showed the flexibility of her talent by treating with freshness and fidelity the problems of conduct presented by the younger generation after the war. The picture of Teddy Gloucester and her friends in *Nice People* (1920) is accurate; we see vividly depicted the urge for pleasure at any cost and the shadow of boredom lurking over it all for the best of the group, while the others remain perfectly satisfied. The danger Teddy runs in her midnight escapade with Scottie Wilbur, both inflamed by liquor and passion, is indicated in a masterly scene in which the artistic reticence of the playwright scorns the details in which a Gorky or a Dreiser would have revelled. The polite unbelief of Teddy's friends in her story of the advent of Billy Wade and his midnight conversation with Teddy while Scottie lay in his drunken stupor on the couch, is also a clever touch. Miss Crothers does not make them all mere types—Eileen and Hallie are clearly differentiated; so are Trevor and Oliver.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

The defect with *Nice People* is that we cannot quite believe in Teddy's reformation, and her determination to give up the life she has lived and spend her days in the open air with Billy Wade is hardly convincing.

Nice People was a popular success; *Everyday* (1921) was a failure, yet it was in some respects a more significant play. Miss Crothers laid the scene in the Middle West and depicted the rebellion of a girl who has been educated beyond the environment of her home and the tyranny of her father, who exercises a control over his wife almost beyond belief in this country. Yet the character of the mother, played by Minnie Dupree, remains one of Miss Crothers' best creations. At the end the daughter goes out of the front door and leaves her mother to face her husband's wrath.

Undeterred by her failure in *Everyday*, Miss Crothers produced her sympathetic exposition of the present day youth in *Mary the Third* (1923). She shows us Mary the First in 1870 taking her mate by the lure of physical attraction; then she pictures Mary the Second in 1897 being taken by the man who among her lovers is the most insistent. And then, bringing these two women into the play as grandmother and mother, she reveals Mary the Third in 1923, mistress of a vocabulary that conceals nothing and with a determination to know the theory and practice of marriage, before which conventions fly. The periodic scenes are not mere preludes; every appeal to propriety from the horrified grandmother's lips sends the audience back to the memory of her conduct on the sofa in 1870! And the despair of the children when they overhear their father and mother strip their married life of its illusions is really a dramatic theme, which Miss Crothers published first as a one-act play. When the curtain falls on this second Act it seems impossible for the family life to go on, but Miss Crothers shows that the irresistible pressure of habit will bring the parents together again and that Mary the Third will choose her mate just as her mother did, because he needs her most—or she thinks he does. Human nature makes the end-

RACHEL CROTHERS

ing of *Mary the Third* probable, but to call it a happy ending is to misunderstand a few essentials.

In 1924 Miss Crothers turned from the celebration and scrutiny of irrepressible youth to a satire of the cult of adult self-expression. As usual she was concerned not so much with novelty of plot, for the framework of *Expressing Willie* was not new. Minnie Whitcomb, a music teacher who comes from the Middle West, is a simple, natural girl. So is Mrs. Smith, who invites Minnie to visit her in order to counteract the influence upon Willie Smith, her son, of a group of ultra-modern people who live on the outskirts of art and of fashion. Willie has made money in tooth paste and his new friends are quite willing to share his hospitality and pretend that he is one of them. Modest despite his success in business, he stands in awe of them. But his mother, penetrating beneath their pretence, and desperate in her efforts to circumvent them, especially the widow Frances Sylvester, who has marked Willie for her own, sends for Minnie as a last hope. Minnie herself falls under their spell at first, but her love for Willie reacts in an unexpected way. Visiting him in his bedroom at night, she begs him in terms of the new psychology to express his real self and win Frances, the symbol of all that is brilliant and desirable. When Frances herself arrives on the scene and Minnie takes refuge in the closet, it would seem as though Miss Crothers had deliberately chosen the most hopelessly ancient of devices to prove her originality. For the ensuing scene is high comedy and the artificial poseurs are routed by the alliance of a girl's unselfish love and a mother's shrewd wisdom, born of her devotion. Often have the love of a sweetheart and of a mother been pitted against each other on the stage. It remained for Miss Crothers to join them in a Holy Alliance against the powers of selfishness and pretence. The performances of Chrystal Herne as Minnie and Louise Closser Hale as Mrs. Smith were of a high order, but to Miss Crothers as playwright and director there rose from the critics who had been so often unaware of her achievement a veritable chorus of appreciation. How

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

deft was her art can best be appreciated by a comparison of *Expressing Willie* with Booth Tarkington's *Country Cousin*.

In *A Lady's Virtue* (1925) Miss Crothers produced a human and natural play, but was hampered by her yielding to the demands of the two actresses for whom the play was written. Her real interest lay in the character of the eternal courtesan, Madame Sisson, and her entrance into the Halstead family was delightful. But the part of Sally Halstead, the rather silly wife who has invited her to visit them, demanded more extended treatment than the plot would bear, and in consequence the playwright, yoking her wagon to two stars, failed to write a convincing play.

The first and the most lasting impression that the work of Rachel Crothers leaves is that of the craftsman. So easy is the flow of her dialogue that it is often unappreciated by the school of critics who are looking constantly for the unusual and the peculiar. Writing for a quarter of a century, she has had few stage failures, and to another school of critics this almost unvarying success seems suspicious. It must, they argue, be because of her acceptance of standards which have sent other playwrights to the wall. But meanwhile Miss Crothers has gone steadily about her own task, and has used the real talent that is hers for the entertainment of those who seek the playhouse for that purpose. It is talent rather than genius which is her portion and she is abundantly conscious of the fact. But instead of railing at conditions she cannot change, she has unfolded a panorama of characters and scenes which are aimed at audiences of intelligence who desire, however, no oversubtlety of motive or expression. So determined has she been not to become a "literary person" that it is remarkable how well her plays like *A Man's World*, *He and She*, or *Nice People* read in print. Without inventive power of the highest order, she is a keen observer of life, especially in the concrete, and her plays are filled with minor characters who indeed at times, notably in *39 East*, attract attention more easily than the major ones.

RACHEL CROTHERS

Her view of life is sane and progressive. She has a keen hatred for injustice and in her early plays, like *A Man's World* and *Ourselves*, she conducted a crusade for a more equitable adjustment of the claims of woman. Of late her ardor in this direction has cooled, and she has turned her scrutiny upon the failings of her own sex. With this diminution in intensity has come a greater subtlety, and a growth from the domestic comedy of *A Man's World* to the social comedy of *Expressing Willie*. This ability to progress, to keep abreast of the fashions of the theatre and the conditions of life, reveals the flexibility and adaptability which are her most characteristic traits. But the quality that lifts her work above the mass of modern playwriting is epitomized in a sentence in *Nice People*: "The vital things of character don't belong to anybody's day—they're eternal and fundamental." She has steadily declined to take the superficial currents of opinion seriously and she has in consequence been called conventional and conservative. But in the final judgment of the discriminating she will have her reward.

CHAPTER XV

MITCHELL, WILLIAMS AND THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

AS A consequence of the impossibility of treating in separate chapters all the playwrights of the Twentieth Century, one is forced into the search for categories which will not be artificial classifications, but will be of service in establishing the channels into which our play writing has run. So unsatisfactory are these categories that they may be used only with apology and must be flanked by definitions. Yet the term social comedy has some definiteness. We have found it to be the medium through which Bronson Howard and Clyde Fitch established their best effects, and their example, perhaps, led their successors to attempt a broader scope of theme and treatment than was permitted by the European comedy of manners. Social drama in America has a wider sphere than the drawing-room comedy of an older day, and, while it proceeds most frequently by means of satire, it is not limited to that mode of approach. Its prime essential lies in its employment of social inhibitions to accelerate or to prevent the actions of the characters. It takes place frequently in a house rather than in a home, and, while it is concerned often with the relations of husband and wife or parents and children, it is not limited by domestic ties as is the domestic drama. That at times it is so hard to distinguish it from the latter lies, perhaps, in the stronger bond of the domestic relations in the United States, where marriages are still based not so much on social convenience as on natural selection. As this becomes less often true, it is probable that our social drama will become more frequent.

It is obvious that the writer of this form of play must be equipped by breeding for the recognition of social values.



Most Sincerely Yours,
Langdon Whitehelf

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

Langdon Elwyn Mitchell was born in Philadelphia, February 17, 1862, the son of Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, the novelist and poet, and grew up in an atmosphere which sharpened his sense of social distinctions. Educated at St. Paul's School at Concord and by three years' stay abroad, he studied law at Harvard and Columbia Universities and was admitted to the bar in New York in 1886. But already he had published, in 1885, his *Sylvian and Other Poems*, *Sylvian* being a tragedy partly in verse, laid in Cordova in the Seventeenth Century. In 1892 occurred his marriage with Miss Marion Lea, who later created the part of Vida Phillimore in *The New York Idea*.

A writer of short stories as well as verse, Mitchell approached the stage with a quality which makes his work enduring. In 1899 he scored his first success in his dramatization of *Vanity Fair* under the title of *Becky Sharp*. Beginning September 12, 1899, it ran for two years in New York and on tour, and was revived by Mrs. Fiske ten years later. Its popularity prompted three other dramatic versions of the novel, one of which so closely resembled *Becky Sharp* that it was stopped by injunction. Mrs. Fiske was consummate in the part, and Mitchell wisely built up the play around the character. The Battle of Waterloo and the scene in which Rawdon Crawley finds Becky and Lord Steyne together remain in the memory most vividly, and the latter provided Maurice Barrymore with a splendid opportunity, of which he took full advantage. The adaptation of Weir Mitchell's *Adventures of François* (1900) was not a success. There were possibilities, however, in the play, and the scene in which the Paris waif and the Marquis keep the staircase from the rush of the Jacobin mob was a vivid stage picture.

Perhaps Mitchell's success with the material of the great social satirist showed him where his real strength lay. For, after an adaptation from the Yiddish of Jacob Gordin, *The Kreutzer Sonata* (1906), in which Bertha Kalich made a decided impression, Mitchell wrote his sterling comedy, *The New York Idea*, which was produced November 19, 1906, with a

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

cast including Mrs. Fiske, Marion Lea, John Mason, George Arliss and Emily Stevens, and which has taken its place at the head of our social comedies. That Mitchell caught the spirit of the new century has been proved by the successful revival of the play by Grace George in 1915.

The title which indicates the theme, that of divorce, is in one sense a misnomer, for, as the playwright has acknowledged to me, the people are Philadelphians. Nowhere else could be found quite the same profound self-contentment and surety of standards as the Phillimores represent. Mitchell's skill, too, is revealed from the start in his delicate distinction between Judge Philip Phillimore, who has brushed aside some of the artificial code, and his mother and aunt who have built up their lives upon it. Grace, his younger sister, who is a bit rebellious against the prohibitions of the code, and Cousin William Sudley, the male snob, are also clearly differentiated. But, however different they may be, the tribal instinct, taken in with the air they breathe, unites them against Mrs. Cynthia Karslake, a divorcée, whom Philip is to marry. She has divorced John Karslake through impulse, but still loves him. Judge Phillimore has also divorced his wife, Vida, who is a perfect example of the refined vampire, and while it is difficult to believe in the contretemps which brings them all together in the first Act, such is Mitchell's brilliancy of dialogue that one forgives all the improbability for its sake. What lifts the dialogue above the average comedy of its time is its sincerity. It is never forced for the sake of the laugh. It springs out of the nature of the character and it helps the play on. Notice the approach to Karslake's character through the description of Cynthia:

Sudley: (Always ready to think the worst) We might put up with that. But you don't mean to tell me Philip has the—
—the—the—assurance to marry a woman who has been divorced by—

Miss Heneage: Not at all. Cynthia Karslake divorced her husband.

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

Sudley: (Gloomily, since he has less fault to find than he had expected) She divorced him! Ah! (He sips his tea.)

Miss Heneage: The suit went by default. And, my dear William, there are many palliating circumstances. Cynthia was married to Karslake only seven months. There are no— (glancing at Grace) no hostages to Fortune! Ahem!

Sudley: (Still unwilling to be pleased) Ah! What sort of a young woman is she?

Grace: (With the superiority of one who is not too popular) Men admire her.

Miss Heneage: She's not conventional.

Mrs. Phillimore: (Showing a faint sense of justice) I am bound to say she has behaved discreetly ever since she arrived in this house.

Miss Heneage: Yes, Mary—but I sometimes suspect that she exercises a degree of self-control—

Sudley: (Glad to have something against some one) She claps on the lid, eh? And you think that perhaps some day she'll boil over? Well, of course, fifteen or twenty millions—but who's Karslake?

Grace: (Very superciliously) He owns Cynthia K. She's the famous mare.

Miss Heneage: He's Henry Karslake's son.

Sudley: (Beginning to make the best of it) Oh!—Henry!—Very respectable family. Although I remember his father served a term in the Senate. And so the wedding is to be to-morrow?

Into this reunion of divorcées there is introduced Sir Wilfrid Cates-Darby, an Englishman who reveals Mitchell's knowledge of that nation. He is not the caricature known to our stage, but the man who, while he speaks less readily than we do, acts often more quickly. With the characters established, Mitchell develops them in the striking scene in Vida's boudoir, in which, against the background of idle luxury, he reveals her, angling for John Karslake, who still loves Cynthia, and Sir Wilfrid, who has been attracted to both women and who solemnly proposes to Vida that she marry him in case Cynthia refuses. This element of farce is the one blot on the character drawing of the play, but we forget it on account of the strong scene which

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

follows between Cynthia and John. Seldom have the relations between a divorced wife and husband who still care for each other been painted so adroitly. The rage into which Cynthia flies when she finds she has betrayed her emotion, her feminine twisting of the situation to her own advantage, and the curtain scene in which Sir Wilfrid and Cynthia depart for the races to try and see if she "has a whim" for him, show the daring of the dramatist, who carries his audience by the instinctive power of genius. If the second Act startles one, the third Act carries him away. It may be impossible to conceive in cold blood of the circumstances which bring them all together at the preparation for the wedding at ten o'clock at night, but, as the stage direction says, "as he [John Karslake] knows his coming to the ceremony on whatever pretext is a social outrage, he carries it off by assuming an air of its being the most natural thing in the world." Vida's flirtation with John "cuts both ways"—it attracts Sir Wilfrid and it raises Cynthia's jealousy. Then the play rises out of farce to utter sincerity, when John reveals to Cynthia her real feelings for him:

John: (Quickly on her last word but speaking gravely) Indeed!

Will you? And *why* do you care what happens to me?

Cynthia: (Startled by his tone) I—I—ah—

John: (Insistently and with a faint hope) Why do you care?

Cynthia: I don't. Not in your sense—

John: How dare you then pretend—

Cynthia: I don't pretend.

John: (Interrupting her; proud, serious and strong) How dare you look me in the face with the eyes that I once kissed, and pretend the least regard for me? (*Cynthia recoils and looks away. Her own feelings are revealed to her clearly for the first time.*) I begin to understand our American women now. Fireflies—and the fire they gleam with is so cold that a midge couldn't warm his heart at it, let alone a man. You're not of the same race as a man! You married me for nothing, divorced me for nothing, because you *are* nothing!

Cynthia: (Wounded to the heart) Jack! What are you saying?

John: (With unrestrained emotion) What,—you feigning an in-

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

terest in me, feigning a lie—and in five minutes— (*Gesture indicating altar.*) Oh, you've taught me the trick of your sex—you're the woman who's not a woman!

Cynthia: (Weakly) You're saying terrible things to me.

John: (Low and with intensity) You haven't been divorced from me long enough to forget—what you should be ashamed to remember.

The curtain of this act, after Cynthia has fled, unable to go through with the wedding, is delightful. The choir boys have been placed ready to sing at a signal from Reverend Matthew Phillimore, and, mistaking his raised hands of protest, they burst into the hymn:

“Enduring love—sweet end of strife!
Oh, bless this happy man and wife!”

The last act is not so important, but John and Cynthia find their divorce was not legal, and Vida secures Sir Wilfrid.

The final impression of *The New York Idea* is one of rich invention, of consummate theatrical skill, and of a social knowledge so secure that it dares to go to the edge of farce or of the sentimental, knowing that it can return at any moment. The play is more than a mere satire on divorce. It is a celebration of the triumph of real love, about to make a mistake because of the pressure of social customs, and saved by the resurgence of human passion, aided by the spirited defiance of social law and by the skilful manipulation of social opportunities. Its universal quality has been proven by the critical success of *Jonathans Tochter*, under which title it was put on at Berlin, under Reinhardt's direction, in 1916, although the war prevented its receiving a fair hearing. It has also been translated into Danish, Swedish and Hungarian.

The wonder is that Mitchell never repeated his success. *The New Marriage*, which Mrs. Fitch produced in 1911, had clever dialogue but a plot almost farcical. It was a study of marriage, revolving around two couples, Wilmer and Agnes Bromley, high-strung, tired of the “dull, unceasing monogamy

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

of daily existence," and Horace and Leona Byethorne, married flirts who become entangled in a cross flirtation. Although it had a brilliant first Act, the interest was not sustained, and the play was not successful on the stage. *Pendennis* (1916) was, however, much more fortunate. Mitchell built this dramatization of Thackeray's novel for John Drew, who interpreted the character of Major Pendennis admirably. The play is a series of scenes in which the Major presides over the love affairs of Arthur Pendennis, and the worldly-wise old officer and gentleman easily retained his interest as the leading character. *Pendennis* does not provide as rich an opportunity for the dramatist as *Vanity Fair*, and the play was not as successful as *Becky Sharp*, but it was a charming interpretation of Victorian life in England.

In the year of the production of *The New York Idea* Jesse Lynch Williams saw his first play on the professional stage. He was born in Stirling, Illinois, August 17, 1871, graduated from Princeton University in 1892 and became known first as a novelist and writer of short stories. Indeed it is only at intervals that Williams writes for the stage, for he works slowly, and the difficulties of production, commercial and otherwise, are obnoxious to him.¹

The Stolen Story is not social drama: it is a play based on Williams' newspaper experiences. Billy Woods, the central character, is a real reporter, and the atmosphere of loyalty and the sense of the brotherhood of the craft which obtains in the offices of a great metropolitan newspaper is well caught. The climax of the play is gripping. Woods, having been discharged by his managing editor, and employed by a rival sheet, discovers a great "story" of political corruption which involves Senator Cunningham, the father of the girl he loves. To save the Senator, he has to appear in false colors even to her, and keyed up to a forgetfulness of everything but the one supreme goal, he forgets his discharge and returns to his desk

¹ See his interesting account of the production of *Why Marry?* in *Contemporary American Plays*, pp. 2-4.

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

at his old paper. The way in which the city editor senses the situation and keeps everyone, even the emissaries of the rival sheet, from breaking into Wood's absorbed writing of the "story," built up a masterly scene. The interest is professional rather than social, but the instinctive trust of the gentlewoman in the gentleman, which keeps Frances Cunningham true to Woods against all appearances, showed Williams' understanding of the finer shades of feeling. The *Stolen Story* was produced in Providence, in April, 1906, and after success there and in Chicago, went into New York in the autumn. Peculiar managerial stupidity seems alone to have prevented a long run. By a curious stroke of fate, the tour ended in Columbus, Ohio, where *Why Marry?* was born.

Why Marry? was published in 1914 as *And So They Were Married* and it was only after the comedy had been put on by amateurs that the commercial managers saw possibilities in one of the most successful plays of its day. It opened in Columbus, Ohio, November 1, 1917, with Nat Goodwin in the leading part of the lawyer and uncle who represents the voice of society in general. Goodwin's death while the play was in its second season had a disastrous effect on its history. It was awarded the first Pulitzer Prize for the best American play of the year 1917-8.

Why Marry? is not an attack upon marriage: it is a scrutiny of the institution. It begins by the capture of Rex Baker by Jean, who doesn't love him, but "who has been brought up to be married and nothing else." She is the younger sister-in-law of Lucy, mistress of a handsome house and John's wife, who is not so frank as Jean in the interview between the two women after Rex has gone. John is a successful business man "with plenty of ability but little perception," and he has invited to this week-end party his Uncle Everett, a judge who is a genial satirist of life; Cousin Theodore, a human clergyman; Ernest Hamilton, a scientist; and Helen, John's other sister, who demands a career and is assisting Ernest in his

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

laboratory. Williams puts into the Judge's mouth a sweeping criticism of conditions:

Judge: It's all on a sliding scale, John. For keeping up the cost of living, you and old man Baker get—oh, so much. (*Stretches arms out full length.*) For saving the Constitution, I get, well, I get a good deal myself. (*Rises, hands three feet apart.*) For saving in wages and operating expenses, your superintendent gets—so much. (*Hands two feet apart.*) For saving human life, Ernest Hamilton gets—so much. (*Hands six inches apart.*) For saving immortal souls, Theodore gets—so much. (*Holds up two forefingers an inch apart.*) Now if anyone came along and saved the world—

Theodore: (*Interrupts*) They crucified Him.

Hamilton is a new kind of stage hero—as Helen describes him to her family, who are ardently discussing marriage:

Helen: Why, to me he's a perfect hero of romance!

John: (*Sneers*) Never even saw a battle—mollycoddle germ-killer.

Helen: The battle against yellow fever, John, down in Cuba. No drums to make him brave, no correspondents to make him famous—merely rolled up his sleeve and let an innocent-looking mosquito bite him, and then took notes on his symptoms till he became delirious. He happened to be among those who recovered. Four of the others died. (*She is betrayed into showing considerable feeling, after all.*)

Williams describes him in other terms:

(*Enter Ernest Hamilton, about thirty-five years old; although a highbrow, he looks like a pretty good fellow, and he is not in the least shy or embarrassed, being "well born and well bred." He talks very rapidly; does not take the trouble to despise conventions; merely views them with frank, scientific curiosity, tinged with amused contempt. He is startlingly honest.*)

As played by Shelley Hull, he can be seen in any scientific laboratory to-day. The struggle between the love of Helen



John Lynch Williams

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

and Ernest and their belief that marriage is a handicap to a man of science provides the main conflict which is essential to drama. But in order to secure sympathy for their point of view, Williams draws a picture of another kind of marriage in the conversation between John and Lucy at breakfast, and her revolt, after years of suffering, is quite in keeping with her futile nature. Helen paints an ideal picture of life together without marriage, and Theodore remarks:

Theodore: But if you love him, my dear, marriage brings together those who love each other truly.

Helen: But those who love each other truly, don't need anything to bring them together. The difficulty is to keep them apart.

As Helen tells them, first, that she has refused Ernest's proposal, second, that he knows nothing about her plan, they are horrified, and when he leaves her after she has refused to marry him, the tribe turn on her and tell her he despises her. But in the midst of this conversation Ernest returns. John demands why he went. He replies, "To protect her from myself." And when John continues, "Then why come back?" Ernest answers, "To protect her from you," and they depart together. The Judge brings them back and plans a family party for the announcement of the trip to Paris and, after a most amusing scene, he tricks them cleverly.

Judge: (To Helen and Ernest, who are hand in hand) Helen, you know, because you've said it, that in the sight of God you are taking this man to be your husband—

Helen: Why, of course. In the sight of God—I take Ernest to be my husband, but—

Judge: And you, Ernest?

Ernest: Why, of course, in the sight of God—but—

Judge: (Hand raised—angust—authoritative) Then, since you, Helen, and you, Ernest, have made this solemn declaration before God, and in the presence of witnesses, I by the authority vested in me by the laws of this state do now pronounce you man and wife.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Williams did not force a happy ending. As the Judge says:

Judge: (To Ernest. Raising his hand. All are silent) All you've said of marriage is true. There is only one thing worse—and that is what you tried to do. But bad as marriage is, until we reform it, it is the best we have to offer you. What are you going to do about it? (*Loud and laughing*) Separate and get divorced?

The problem is similar to that faced by Moody in *The Faith Healer*, but Williams treats it in the spirit of comedy and yet arrives at much the same conclusion. But the love of Helen and Ernest is deeper than if they had not had the test through which they have passed.

Why Marry? was a comedy of institutions. Williams called his next play, *Why Not?* (1922), a "comedy of conventions," for, while marriage was the theme of the first, divorce is the subject of the second. The plot was derived from the author's own story, *Remating Time*. Leonard and Mary Chadwick find themselves butler and maid in the house of Bill and Evadne Thompson, and the realization that both couples are mismated and that they should rearrange their marital relations on the basis of earlier love which has been thwarted, provides a situation which Williams' skill keeps from being farcical. The author's own description of the characters reveals them better than any interpretation:

The two married couples in this play, although there is a touch of phantasy in their behavior, are of a sort often met in life, though seldom on the stage. Intellectually, they are neither "low-brow" nor "high-brow"; socially, neither "low-life" nor "high-life"—that is, they are not in the least smart, though they doubtless would be classified as "Society people," if they got into the newspapers. They are simple, gracious gentlefolk; too well-born, well-bred and well-disposed toward one another and the world to think much about intellectual or social "position." Nor do they talk about "My Sense of Humor"—and thus demonstrate how little they possess. Indeed, they are rather old-fashioned. They even go to Church. Nevertheless they are all good.

The incongruity of this atmosphere helps to make the fun of

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

their fantastic predicament. For this is a comedy of Human Nature *versus* Human Institutions.

The situation in which Smith, a friendly lawyer, suggests official adultery as the only possible way of solving the difficulty is used by Williams to bombard the eccentricities of our divorce laws, with a dialogue so brilliant that the audience lost at times the subtlety in the frequency of epigram. He faces the complete situation by providing each pair with a child, but he provides no real solution. That, he has explained to me, is not his affair; he leaves that to the sociologist. To a French or Italian playwright, the satisfaction of passion would have been taken for granted as the great necessity. In America, the prime essential to be preserved is the individual's self-respect. Williams' great achievement lies in the way he strips conventions of their pretences and yet leaves life clothed in its precious illusions.

Lovely Lady (1925) is a comedy dealing with the relations of parents and children. The central character, Julia Dashiels, is a clever philanderer, who fascinates both Stanley Linton and his father, and really brings them together on a friendlier footing after their mutual discovery of her manipulations. Mrs. Linton, wife and mother, with much cleverness lets the situation work itself out. The conversation was on Williams' high level, but the play was a commercial failure for reasons hard to understand. The characterization in *Lovely Lady* was not so real as that in *Why Not?*, just as neither equaled in sharpness the drawing in *Why Marry?*. But the very object of Williams' art, his intense scrutiny of institutions, leads away from characterization. Divorce is satirized in *The New York Idea*, but what we remember first are the vivid personalities; the institution of divorce fades into the background. In *Why Not?* it is never forgotten and the characters are not as distinct. This does not imply that Williams' art is less fine than Mitchell's; the very subtlety of the former prevents him from creating such portraits. Perhaps life itself is growing

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

less dependent upon character and more upon institutions, good and evil. But an historian of the drama cannot change his belief that the permanent test of drama is the creation of character.

The supreme difficulty of maintaining the tone of social comedy is illustrated best by the work of those who attempt it and fail to reach the standard set by Mitchell and Williams.

The failure of Albert E. Thomas (1872-) to achieve real distinction in this field is the more to be regretted since at times he has flashes of inspiration and since he is able to draw gentlemen and gentlewomen. His first play, *Her Husband's Wife* (1910), had as its theme the selection, by a woman who thinks she is ill, of a second wife for her husband. This plot is reminiscent of *Love in Tandem*, Augustin Daly's adaptation of *Vie à deux*, but it is worked out somewhat differently.

The Rainbow (1912), which, like *Her Husband's Wife*, was a popular success, is a clever social comedy in which the reconciliation of a husband and wife, who have been separated partly by misunderstanding and partly by the inability of the socially trained to express their real feelings, is brought about by their daughter. It is just the type of play which Bronson Howard introduced in *Young Mrs. Winthrop*, but the affection of Cynthia for her father is a solvent better suited to the theatre than the emotion awakened in the Winthrops over their child's grave. The tone is kept here better than in *Come Out of the Kitchen* (1916), *Just Suppose* (1920), or *Only 38* (1921). In *Just Suppose*, a romantic drama in which the Prince of Wales runs off and visits a Southern family, Thomas establishes quite well the poise with which Linda Lee Stafford meets the difficult situation caused by the mutual love of the Prince and herself. Then, apparently unable to trust the audience to use their intelligence, he introduces the preposterous scene between the British minister and Linda, in which the whole atmosphere is precipitated into farce.

The best play by Thomas, in which he collaborated with Clayton Hamilton, is *The Better Understanding*, acted with

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

success in California by Henry Miller in May 1917, but not yet produced in the East. It is a serious study of the eternal triangle, but with more reality than is usually permitted in the theatre. When John Newton discovers that Philip Gibbs loves his wife, Grace, and intends to go away with her, and that he has lost her love through his immersion in his affairs, he determines to fight for her. So did John Rutherford in *The Wife* in 1887, but John Newton uses different weapons, for his conception of marriage is different. As he puts it, "A woman's love belongs to her husband only just so long as he deserves it and can keep it." Newton pretends that he is unaware of the name of the woman Philip loves and, in a masterly scene, he puts to Grace and Philip the case of the supposed husband who, though he has appeared to neglect his wife, really loves her. Like the people in *Why Not?*, they are all essentially decent, and Philip and Grace say good-by. There is still another step to be taken, however. John's pride has had its inevitable reaction and he cannot beg for the love in which he only half believes. Again there is verity in John's answer to his sister, Kate, "I hope you may never live to be pitied by some one you love. It's horrible." Grace lets him see how her love for Philip was the mature counterpart of that desire for love itself which is so much talked about in more youthful situations. It is a real impulse in many lives, however, and it is handled with distinction by the playwrights even to the curtain speech, in which Grace lets John see the difference between the love she had built up out of heartache and the love she really feels for him.

There have been sporadic successes in the field of social comedy, by playwrights whose work has been interrupted or who have gone into other fields. *A Woman's Way* (1909), by Thompson Buchanan (1877-), succeeded through its deft use of theatrical situations and its portraiture of Marion Stanton, a young wife who wins back her husband's regard by fighting for it against a more sophisticated rival. Buchanan made clever use of his newspaper experience, for, like A. E.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Thomas, he belongs to that group of college bred men who, about 1910, came into the theatre through the training of journalism. Of his later plays, *Civilian Clothes* (1919), while it reflected Buchanan's own war experience, and was a sincere attempt to show the snobbishness of the feminine attitude toward the men in and out of uniform, paid the penalty of its contemporary quality. After some time spent with the moving pictures, Buchanan returned in 1927 to the legitimate stage with *Sinner*, a study of a woman who, under the guise of perfect frankness and sincerity, gives herself to a married man before he secures his divorce, then marries him as a concession to her family, gives herself to her earlier lover in order to revenge herself upon her husband for his inattention, and calmly accepts his apology because he at last proves to her that she is first in his affections. The absurdity of this spectacle may have been due to Buchanan's association with a meretricious art, but its sole interest lies in the contrast between his earlier more sincere work and his response to the contemporary urge for sensation.

The Unchastened Woman (1915), by Louis Kaufman Anspacher (1878-), has attracted attention on account of its central character, Caroline Knollys, a woman of wealth who makes dextrous use of her social experience and moral unscrupulousness to gratify her sense of power over those near her. She is extremely well drawn, but the other characters are foils and types, and the relations of her husband and his mistress, upon which the plot turns, do not secure belief. The play was successful when first presented, but when revived in 1926 it made no distinct impression, possibly owing to the stress laid upon factory reform and the iniquity of the custom house.

One of the essential qualities of the comedy of manners is lightness of touch. The comedies of Clare Kummer possess this attribute almost to perfection. Of plot there is little. Mrs. Kummer imagines or perhaps hears of a large estate which is usually allowed to remain empty and straightway her fancy peoples it with "Annabelle Leigh, who has a husband

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

somewhere" and a group of her friends, mostly artists and all insolvents, who fill gayly and irresponsibly positions from that of head cook down. There are two shares of stock which float through the play, but their main purpose is to provide a delightful satire upon modern psychological methods of discovering a thief by means of verbal suggestion. Wickham, the detective, is examining the servants:

Wickham: Now—I say the words "expectant—radical—Anthony Comstock—misanthrope." What word comes to you? (*sharp and quick*) Quick, the word!

Lottie: (*Sadly and slowly*) There's always something the matter with everyone that likes me—I have a brother in the asylum—I wish you could meet him. You remind me of him so much.

But what carried *Good Gracious, Annabelle* (1916) into high favor was the steady sparkle of the dialogue. It may be called comedy of manners because really all that remains in the memory is the complete suitability of the actions of these characters to any situation that occurs, and the skill, born of a sure knowledge of the weapons of social warfare, which carries Annabelle through her difficulties. The only form of drama to which it may be compared is the French *vaudeville*. But from the American vaudeville it is far removed, notwithstanding its superficial resemblance. It is true that question and answer follow each other with a rapidity that leaves one breathless, but there is only occasionally the obvious planting of the question for the mere sake of the reply which is so apparent in the work of Ade or Cohan. One minor situation in *A Successful Calamity* (1917) will illustrate this distinction. Henry Wilton, a wealthy merchant, pretends he is ruined in order to see what his young second wife and children will do about it. All rise to the occasion, and then Connors, the butler, apologetically offers his bankbook to his master. This situation, too well-worn for pathos, is given a new turn. Wilton, played by Gillette, asks with a courtesy all his own, "But are you sure you can spare it?" Connors hastens to reassure him. "Oh

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

yes, sir. You see my sister's husband is dead, and she doesn't need my help any more, sir." To anyone who remembers this perennial situation, the reply comes with special point, but the important thing is that it comes out of that situation and is not merely a verbal explosion.

The very security of the social instincts of most of Clare Kummer's characters provides contrast to the unworldliness of others, such as the heroine of *Be Calm, Camilla* (1918). We are never quite sure whether Camilla, in her progress through cabaret and boarding house to the bliss of the hospital and Patterson's palatial lodge, is shielded by angels or by a sophistication too deep for tears. In *Rollo's Wild Oat* (1920) the gaiety becomes hilarious during the scenes which prepare for Rollo's playing Hamlet, but leads to a fiasco, when the telegram announcing his grandfather's dangerous illness sends Ophelia to him in the midst of the opening scene. The subtlest portions of the comedy, however, spring from the ever-present sense on Rollo's part that he is different from the professional actors, not artistically but socially. He can never step out of his part in life and, of course, can never be an actor.

Sometimes the plot becomes so tenuous that even the dialogue fails to hold it together. This was the case with *Pomeroy's Past* (1922), which had to be withdrawn after its tryout in Philadelphia but went on again in 1926. The attempt to provide Pomeroy Chilton with an illegitimate child, in order to make him attractive, was hardly successful.

In *The Mountain Man* (1920) Mrs. Kummer attempted a more serious study of the North Carolina mountaineers. But the effort only proved that her own earlier manner was her best, though the character of Aaron Winterfield, the son of a patrician and a mountain girl, is interesting in his revelation of the way in which the pride which was his father's bequest becomes his danger and also his salvation.

Some of the most interesting of our social dramas have been the work of playwrights who began in other fields. James Forbes (1871-), whose earlier work lay in the drama of

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

domestic types, rose to a higher rank of achievement in *The Famous Mrs. Fair* (1919). This is a study of the effect upon a woman of the fame that she has acquired through her war work in France. She returns after an absence of four years to find her young daughter grown up, her son engaged to be married, and her husband being comforted by the widow next door. This play, which begins with comedy, rises at the end of the third Act to a very tense situation after Mrs. Fair finds out the relations that have been existing between her husband and Mrs. Brice. Then comes the announcement that Sylvia, her daughter, has run off with Dudley Gillette, Mrs. Fair's manager on her lecture tour. As Henry Miller, in the part of Jeffrey Fair, reached for the telephone to call police headquarters, one could see his face grow old. Another telling scene occurs in the third Act, when Sylvia outlines the situation to her father and mother as she sees it. Forbes continued to write social drama in *The Endless Chain* (1922), dealing with a real situation in the lives of people who come from smaller towns and try to make a social life in New York City. It was not successful, but it had some quietly effective scenes, and it was much more artistic than his earlier farces.

Among recent social drama of significance was *The Changelings* (1923), by Lee Wilson Dodd (1879-). Dodd is a poet with some claim to consideration on account of the finish of his verse. He has been writing for the stage since 1909, when *The Return of Eve* was played. But his farce comedies like *His Majesty Bunker Bean* (1916) and *Pals First* (1916) need not detain us. In *The Changelings* Dodd revealed through skilful representation of character that in real marriage there is no ending; in false marriage there was no beginning. Its success must be attributed partially to the remarkable cast, headed by Henry Miller and including Blanche Bates, Laura Hope Crews, and Ruth Chatterton. After three married couples, parents and children, have skirted the very edge of destruction, the powerful clutch of decency draws them back. It was refreshing to see an American play in which the four

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

male characters represented an editor, a novelist, a publisher, and a college instructor as human beings.

Gilbert Emery, whose contribution to domestic drama is among the most important made by our playwrights, wrote in *Episode* (1925) a social comedy which treats the triangle in a very modern way. Its first title, *Saving Judy*, is probably the better one, for it reveals the ending, so hopeless yet so true to life. When Arnold Ryesdale finds that his wife Evelyn has been for a time the mistress of his friend Herbert Ballinger, his first instinct is revenge. Then gradually the futility of the position of the husband in our modern social organization is shown. With his emotional life in ruins, the pressure of the countless little things which social life brings up hourly press upon him. Judy Ballinger, Herbert's wife, is waiting for them at her place, where a party is going on. Already they are late and she is telephoning. What is he going to do about it? After revolt and refusal, he is left with no alternative. Shall he tell Judy the real reason? Why not save her, at least, from the agony he has suffered? So a combination of motives, the chivalry of an old friend and the powerful inertia of social custom, drag him off to dinner. Emery has the experience and the taste for social drama; he has the insight to treat life as a great comedy. It is not so easy to evaluate his share in *Love-in-a-Mist* (1926), which he and Amélie Rives (Princess Troubetskoy) wrote in collaboration, but while it is a charming comedy, it has not the significance of his other work. By the grim fate of drama, it succeeded while *Episode* failed.

Of the other playwrights who might claim consideration as writers of social drama, Booth Tarkington and Zoë Akins belong primarily under the category of romance. It is true that, considered superficially, *The Man From Home* (1907) and *The Country Cousin* (1917) seem to imply social contrasts, the first between American and English types, the second between those of the Middle West and New York. But, as we shall see, Tarkington's real interest lies in another direction. His nearest approach to a treatment of social contrasts for

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

themselves alone came in *Tweedles* (1923), which had for a theme the essential snobbishness of everyone. The Castleburys, who are supposed to represent Philadelphia patricians, and the Tweedles, who have lived for generations in a New England town, are both satirized. The scene in which Mr. and Mrs. Castlebury come to the Tweedles' shop to inform the latter that they cannot countenance their son's marriage with Winsora Tweedle on account of the difference in station, only to find that Adam Tweedle believes they are acknowledging their own deficiencies as "mere summer people," has some good moments. But the play failed, partly because of the atrocious miscasting of the Castlebury family.

Among the newer generation, Philip Barry (1896-) is the most promising. A graduate of Yale in 1919, he won the Harvard Prize Play contest in 1922 with *You and I*, produced in 1923. The conflict in this play lies between the claims of love and the passion to create beauty, made concrete in the persons of Maitland White and his son Roderick. In his efforts to prove to Roderick that he should go abroad and study architecture and not let his projected marriage with Veronica Duane interfere, Maitland unconsciously reveals to his wife that his desire to be a painter, which he had given up in order to marry her, has remained hidden in his heart, never quite forgotten. One fine scene in the play occurs when Nancy Maitland watches her husband's face to see what his feelings really are. She reads his secret and urges him to give up his position and do the thing he loves. Another fine scene, reminiscent just a bit of Aldrich's poem *In an Atelier*, is laid in Maitland's studio, in which he is painting Etta, the maid, who has agreed to be a model. His efforts to make her feel like a great lady, and her valiant struggles to become one, form one of the most amusing bits of social comedy our stage has seen.

Barry draws skilfully the contrast between the way in which Nancy cheerfully accepted Maitland's earlier sacrifice and the manner of Veronica's refusal to allow Roderick to give up his career. She persuades him that she does not love him, with a

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

brave imposture that clutches at our sympathies. The conclusion is not very logical, since Maitland invents a legacy to send Roderick to Paris with Veronica, though there is a good satiric touch in the purchase by Maitland's former employer of Etta's picture for a soap advertisement. But there is no question of Maitland's determination to give up his own dream for the sake of his son's, and the great promise of *You and I* lay in the skill with which Barry drew a picture of the comradeship, not always articulate, but rich with understanding, which exists in American families of tradition and breeding. Quiet recognition of responsibility, the making of grave decisions without display, the recognition of the rights of each individual, which are the touchstones of civilization, and by which we have passed from the tribe into beings of a social order, all these are revealed beneath a dialogue clever at times to brilliancy. There are many such fathers, mothers, sons and daughters in America, but they rarely come upon the stage.

At first glance *The Youngest* (1924) might seem to belong to domestic comedy, since it deals with the leading family of a town in New York State and is concerned with the revolt of the youngest son, who has been submerged by the tribal weight of stupidity and selfishness. But the Winslow family are the town institution, and Barry delightfully ridicules their social and economic assumptions. *The Youngest* had not quite the charm, however, of *You and I* or of *In a Garden* (1925). This is a clever, sophisticated social comedy, a bit remote from human interest and with a plot that is perhaps too intricate, but written with distinction and with a real insight into certain qualities of human nature. Adrian Terry, a playwright, and Lissa, his wife, have lived together for nine years happily. Roger Compton, a friend, suggests that Lissa has had an earlier romance with Norrie Bliss in a garden somewhere near Philadelphia. In order to test his wife's affection, Adrian decorates their living room to resemble the garden, of which he has secured photographs, and when Norrie and Lissa are left together the scene and the memories refresh their love and

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

he begs her to go away with him. She has felt for some time that her life is too restricted and determined by her husband's theories, many of which she does not understand and none of which does she like, and she is about to go with Norrie. Then, in a scene after dinner on the same evening, she learns that the earlier romantic interview in the garden was in itself not "the one real thing" in her life but a more or less planned experiment by Norrie, suggested by an earlier remark of Compton's. In consequence she neither goes with her lover nor stays with her husband, but retires to think things over.

If *In a Garden* was too subtle for the public taste, *White Wings* (1926) baffled them, and despite general critical approval it failed to attract audiences. It is a satiric comedy in which the social contrasts have a deeper and yet a subtler implication. The family of Inches have been White Wings or street cleaning contractors for generations, as Archie Inch explains to Mary Todd while they are preparing to go home after a dance in the year 1895. The conversation is so natural that the implications are apparent more easily when the play is read. The horse has become to them a fetish, the symbol of all that is fine in life and they have become dependent upon him. Has the absurdity of family pride that has become stratified ever been put more effectively than in Archie's remark to Mary, whose father had been the furnace man of the Inches?

Archie: Grandfather,—but probably you've heard of him in connection with General Boocock's march upon Antietam?

Mary: I'm a little weak on the Civil War.

Archie: For the fact that a thousand horses rode two hundred miles without leaving a single clue, one man was responsible. And that was my grandfather.

The automobile, which is invented by Mary's father, is used as a symbol of progress which is to drive the horse out of existence. And there is a fine situation when the first automobile breaks down and has to be towed by old Joseph, a cab horse who provides some of the most delightful moments of the comedy.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Barry can put on the stage, too, the gallant defence of the Tory in Archie's refusal to give up the family employment as long as there is a horse left in town, even if he loses Mary's love. But love conquers, for Mary shoots the last horse, poor old Joseph, and takes Archie away in her car, teaching him to run it. Barry's dialogue is expressive as any now written. When Mary begs Archie to marry her he tells of the promise he has made to his mother on her death bed:

Mary: But the dead can't hold the living!

Archie: Oh—can't they!

Mary: A promise like that—

Archie: A promise is a promise.

Mary: Oh, my poor boy.

Archie: And I'll keep it. There's always some one who gets caught between the ages.

Very appealing is the final curtain, when poor old Mr. Inch, Archie's father, who has kept up the struggle to clean the streets until he is worn out, is forced to mount a garbage truck. Stung to the soul, he calls out shrilly, "Strawberries! Strawberries!" The sympathy of the hearer or reader is kept for the Inches by Barry's touch of fantasy which never obtrudes itself, but is at its best when it reveals the soul of a gentleman.

It is the usual commonplace to regret that we have produced no greater number of playwrights to follow the lead of Clyde Fitch in this form of drama. Blame has been laid on the conditions of our theatre, especially the mixed nature of audiences in New York, which make a social comedy less inviting a speculation than a more obvious form of drama. It is true that there is no longer a theatre like Daly's or Wallack's where a sure appeal was made to a public of taste and discrimination. But in the light of the popular success of *The New York Idea* and *Why Marry?* or of Arthur Richman's imitation of the former, *The Awful Truth*, this assumed unreadiness of the American audience may perhaps be overestimated. The truth really lies elsewhere. Fine social comedy is one of the most



Barry

*Pauline, Gen
Philip Barry*

THE LATER SOCIAL COMEDY

difficult forms of art; that is the reason why we have so few specimens. It tolerates no crudities, which often carry the domestic drama; it rejects the violence of melodrama; it distrusts the color of romance.

One handicap, too, which our dramatists of social life have to encounter, is the element of time. A British or French playwright can by the very titles of his *dramatis personæ* prepare the audience for the atmosphere they are to expect. An American playwright must establish the social quality of his characters by their language and actions in the first few moments of the play. This is not an easy task, and his effect may be more easily ruined by a miscasting of parts than in any other form of drama. When all the handicaps are remembered, it is to be wondered, not that we have had so few, but that we have had the sterling examples we possess.

CHAPTER XVI

EDWARD SHELDON, PLAYWRIGHT OF PASSION AND ASPIRATION

THE significance of Edward Sheldon becomes most apparent in an effort to classify his work. He will not fit into any of the general categories into which the modern American drama runs, partly because of the variety of his plays but more especially because of the underlying unity of his purpose and of the individuality which marked him, up to the time of his illness, as one of the most promising playwrights of his time. In an interview given shortly after the production of *The Boss*, Sheldon remarked: "My next play will have beauty," and it was this recognition of the one supremely necessary quality of any art which accounts for his success.

Edward Brewster Sheldon was born in Chicago, February 4, 1886. Before he entered Harvard University he had written plays and he naturally took advantage of the opportunities offered by Professor Baker's courses. He graduated in 1907 and his first professional success came with the production by Mrs. Fiske of *Salvation Nell*, on November 12, 1908.

Salvation Nell was a remarkable play for a young man of twenty-two. The opening scene at the "Empire Bar" of Sid McGovern, with the stage divided by a partition that separated the "Ladies' Buffet" from the barroom, is as realistic a picture of slum life as can be imagined. Its likeness in setting to the first Act of *Anna Christie* is apparent, of course, but there is little similarity in the plot of the two plays. In fact, the effort of Sheldon was to establish the sordid atmosphere of the saloon in order that the rescue of Nell Sanders, by Lieutenant Maggie O'Sullivan of the Salvation Army, should form the emotional climax of the act. Nell is not the usual heroine: she is the mis-

EDWARD SHELDON

of insight in *Bewitched* which reveal the playwright who lifts romance above the level of incident to the heights of character. When Jeannette rebels against her father's opposition to her growing love, and denounces the vampire (really herself) who is destroying the young men that come into the forest, he demands to know how she has learned this. She replies, "When I saw Jimmy, I think I knew everything in the world." Or another remark, of Alice Lea, the girl Jimmie had loved—"Men remember what happened; women remember how it happened"—reveals the quality of the dialogue which in these two instances may be credited to either Sheldon or Howard. It had an imaginative quality which won critical approval, but it did not attract New York audiences, though it ran to capacity houses in Cleveland.

In 1926 a melodrama, *Lulu Belle*, was produced by Belasco and announced as by Edward Sheldon and Charles MacArthur. There was a sordidness about this drama of a negro harlot's progress which was unlike anything else in Sheldon's original plays, and for which it would be idle to try to fix the responsibility. There was, however, a power in the portrayal of the devouring passion of George Randall, the negro who leaves wife and family at the call of Lulu Belle, to follow her even to Paris and to kill her in the end, which savored somewhat of his manner. There were moments, too, in the scenes in front of the tenements and in the café, which showed that the author of *Salvation Nell* had not lost his sense of the picturesque quality that may be obtained from the massing of human beings in surroundings that permit the maximum of emotional expression. But while *Salvation Nell* rose from degradation through suffering to a spiritual height and carried her lover with her, Lulu Belle dragged hers down to the bottom into which she fell herself. More important, the sympathy of the audience was won for Nell: it was never with Lulu Belle and rarely with George Randall, and there was no exaltation in witnessing his struggles, for the object of his desire was beneath him.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

peal to Grace, his *fiancée*, not to abandon him, her loathing and his tigerish clasp of her, were criticized by those who failed to see the profound understanding by the playwright of the effect of the slight negro taint in Philip when he realizes the black drop in his blood. Quite as natural was his determination to play straight, to defy Noyes, to tell his story to the crowd that has come to cheer him, and to show Grace, who has returned to bring him her love again, that there can be no marriage between them. Sheldon had the courage to deal with a large theme, to complete the tragedy logically, but to send Philip on to his bitter task of self-disclosure cheered by the knowledge that Grace still loves him and by the securing of his own self-respect. In the conversation which helps Philip to make his decision, Senator Long tells him: "Ye know, sonny, that's a way God has. He lets us tu'n the bad into good. Sometimes I think we oughtah thank Him mo' fo' that'n anythin' else." This may be the optimism of youth—it may be something far deeper—it is in any case not the flavor of Scandinavian pessimism.

Indeed, while one feels that Sheldon was acquainted with the dramatic literature of his period, its only influence upon him was in the selection of serious topics and a determination to approach them unshrinkingly. He was concerned with native themes, and his next play was a study of the political boss who is also a contractor and who has made a success by building up a modern feudal system, whose bases are the mutual loyalty of chieftain and follower. Michael Regan in *The Boss* (1911) is a well-drawn character. He is not a hero; he crushes those in his way without compunction; he is vulgar in his attempted trickery of the Archbishop; but his word is kept once it is given, and when Porky McCoy, his lieutenant, exceeds his instructions and throws a brick that almost kills Donald Griswold, Regan's brother-in-law and enemy, Regan quietly takes the blame upon himself. He does this just as inevitably as he expects Porky to obey his orders unquestioningly. In other words, he has the tribal instinct of the Celt, and he has also

EDWARD SHELDON

the Celtic reverence for womanly purity. His relations with Emily Griswold, the daughter of a wealthy family of contractors, who marries him to save her father from ruin, with the understanding that she is to be a wife in name only, are not so impossible as they seem at first glance. Sheldon has indicated with delicacy but with sufficient clarity the attraction which Regan's strength and virility have for Emily, and the old fable of Beauty and the Beast has a modern application in the growth of her love for him. As portrayed by Holbrook Blinn, the audiences sympathized with Regan for his courage and devotion to his own standards. Such scenes as that with the Archbishop, with its reminiscence of *Richelieu*, were absurd, but the memory of the unbeaten leader, deserted, he believes, even by his wife, but undaunted, is a vivid one, and his curtain cry on the second Act—"By Gawd, I'll beat 'em yet!"—as his fist crashes on the table, was good theatre and good drama.

While not on such a lofty plane as *The Nigger*, *The Boss* was even more compact and telling in its structure, and the dialogue more direct and crisp. Sheldon is supposed to have drawn Regan from a magazine article upon "Fingey Connors," a political leader, and it seemed as though he were tending in the direction of the group of melodramatic playwrights which grew up in the first decade of the new century and based its work upon contemporary events. But he turned aside to indulge his love of romance in *The Princess Zim-Zim* (1911), a love episode with the background of a side-show at Coney Island. Sheldon's sense of reality showed in the setting of the little stage and auditorium where Tessie Casey becomes three times each day the snake charmer, "Princess Zim-Zim." He depicted well, too, the reaction against a uselessly amusing life which sent Peter Milholland, the young millionaire, to seek adventure and the consequent romance that sprang up between him and Tessie. Peter's cry, "I'm twenty-four years old, I'm on the loose, and I'm looking for romance," strikes a responsive chord in our sympathies. She loves him with her whole being;

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

he loves her with only part of his nature, and the insistent call of his habits and the love for the woman of his own world take him back at last. There is a fine climax to the third Act in which Tessie, having just parted from Peter, rallies at the call of her professional duty and goes on the stage to do her part as usual. This note, incidentally, is the one element which lifted such a melodrama as *Broadway* for a moment to some distinction.

With a somewhat similar plot, and belonging to the same category of fine melodrama, his next play, *Egypt* (1912), was distinctly in an older fashion. A gypsy girl is taken from her tribe by her father, a rich man who, years before, had married a gypsy who had deserted him with her child. The struggle in *Egypt*'s nature between the tendencies inherited from her father and from her mother provides some strong scenes, especially the climax of the third Act, when, on her wedding night, she runs off with Faro, the gypsy she really loves. But the play is one of Sheldon's weakest.

Much better was *The High Road* (1912), in which the study of the motives which determine politics is enriched by Sheldon's growing love of romance. The main interest in *The High Road* is not in the background. It is centered in the character of Mary Page, who begins life as a drudge on her father's farm near Albany and ends as the wife of the Governor, who is about to be elected President of the United States. The theme of the play is best expressed in her conversation with Alan Wilson, the young painter and connoisseur, who takes her from the farm and makes her his mistress.

Mary: (Pointing) Do you see where the moonlight hits the rocks on the top of that hill? It makes it look like a house all built o' gold! Now listen—! D'ye hear somethin'?

Alan: No—do you?

Mary: Oh yes. There's a sound o' music an' o' singin' voices comin' from that house o' gold! Wait! If you listen a little while you can imagine that too—

Alan: (Looking at her) Yes, yes, now I hear.

Mary: D'ye know why they be a-singin'—up there on the hilltop?

EDWARD SHELDON

It's 'cause they're lookin' out over the whole wide world! Think o' the oceans an' the cities lyin' stretched out in the moonlight! Oh, think o' the towers an' the castles o' the kings! They see 'em all from up there— I guess they can see a million miles without no trouble at all—

Alan: Mamie, I've climbed those hills.

Mary: Oh yes!

Alan: (*Sits on stool L. of gate*) It's hard work, but I didn't care. I just pushed along and thought of the welcome waiting for me at the top.

Mary: (*She kneels before him*) An' what was it like when ye got there?

Alan: There was nothing but the plain, bare rocks.

Mary: Wasn't ye awful—disappointed?

Alan: Perhaps—just at first—but then right off I saw the golden house again.

Mary: Where?

Alan: Across the valley—on the hills beyond!—

Mary: An' ye forgot ye was tired an' started after it again!

Alan: Oh yes, one does.

Mary: An' when ye'd climbed up the next hill, it was just the same?

Alan: It always is.

Mary: An' no one's ever walked into that house an' sat close by a winder an' looked out over the whole wide world?

Alan: Not one. But each time that you climb a hill, it seems a little bigger and a little brighter. Each time the voices seem a little nearer—*some lucky ones* have even caught a few words of the song they sing!

It is a similar theme to that treated later by Eugene O'Neill in *Beyond the Horizon*, and its development in the second Act, when she leaves the luxurious apartment in which Alan has placed her, to find an outlet into a life of service, is inspired by Sheldon's sympathy with her unquenchable thirst for better things. Her cry, "Don't you believe that there are some beautiful things beyond just what we see and feel and hear?" puts the case clearly against the cult of mere luxury and beauty. The rest of the play, in which she fights her way out of the net of blackmail spread by the trust magnate who opposes her labors in behalf of the working girl, is not so

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

effective. Sheldon drew accurately enough, however, the situation in which she meets the threat of public scandal by striking first. She is a great relief after the old type of "stage mistress," whose effort was to retain her lover, and, in her refusal to marry Alan because she does not love him, she is sister to Fanny Bolton of *Hindle Wakes*, played in the same year. But her rejection of Alan's offer is not purely for her own freedom as Fanny's was: it is for an opportunity also to help others, and it makes her a nobler figure.

Sheldon's most conspicuous success on the stage was his period play *Romance*. It opened in New York on February 10, 1913, with Doris Keane as Madame Cavallini, and, after a long run in the United States, was produced in London, September 30, 1915, and ran for 1,128 performances. It was then played in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Egypt, Norway and Sweden, and was revived in London in 1926. Translated into French by Robert de Flers and François de Croisset, it was performed at the Théâtre de l'Athénée, in Paris, December 24, 1923.

Its world-wide acceptance was due to the universality of the theme, to the youthful daring which attempted to depict the passion of an American clergyman for an Italian opera singer, and to the sure theatrical instinct which carried Sheldon to success through pitfalls into which many a playwright would have fallen. He secured sympathy at once by the Prologue, in which the Bishop tells the story of his one great emotional adventure to his grandson, in order to keep him from marrying an actress. The story becomes the play and it is endowed with the fragrance with which the memory of youth surrounds romance. The scene shifts to the New York of 1867, and Sheldon's picture of the social standards of the time is as authentic as the Italian which Madame Margherita Cavallini pours out on her pet monkey or her waiting maid, Signora Vannucci. She attracts the Reverend Thomas Armstrong, Rector of St. Giles, at the party of Cornelius van Tuyl, as opposites often do attract each other. When Tom finds out



Edward & The Idole -

EDWARD SHELDON

her past he can forgive her first slip when as a girl she was driven by ignorance and want to give herself. But when Van Tuyl, whose mistress she has been, lies like a true gentleman of romance to save her, she confesses her relations with him to Tom, and the imminence of her sin is too much for the man, if not for the clergyman. The great scene of the play takes place in her apartment at the Brevoort House after the opera. The atmosphere of her life, epitomized by her old attendant, Signora Vannucci, herself a picture of what Madame Cavallini may become, is all carefully prepared to make us feel that a separation is necessary between the lovers. There is a good scene between Van Tuyl and 'Rita, and then Tom breaks in, determined to save her soul. This is the weakest part of the play, but soon the man conquers again and he begs her to give herself to him just for that one night before she departs forever. The resulting appeal, from the good he has awakened in her to the better side of his nature, to leave her with the ideal she has built up of him, is one of those scenes which shows Sheldon's sure understanding of what the theatre means. It invited great success or flat failure, and it won the first. Through the Epilogue, in which the audience return to the Bishop's study, the impression of great passion remains with them, and the Bishop, with a whimsical smile, agrees to marry Harry to his actress and puts on the Victrola the old song which, in the Prologue, has stirred his memory.

It is easy to criticize *Romance* from the point of view of the drama of ideas, but it belongs not in that category but in the drama of emotions, where indeed the permanent masterpieces of the dramatic art belong. The characters are heightened, and the professional touches in Tom's conversation are at times absurd, but the impulse which leads him to make one mad clutch at romance before he settles down to the serenity of the clergyman's life with Susan van Tuyl, his proper mate, makes an appeal to old and young, to those who have a similar memory or to those who have missed it—in short, to nearly all human beings. 'Rita is herself at all times, with the consistency not

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

only of the type, but also of a real woman, and she illustrates that moral contrast so often mentioned, which Bret Harte bequeathed to those who, like Sheldon, know how to make use of it.

In 1914 Sheldon made an unsuccessful attempt to dramatize Sudermann's novel of *Das Hohe Lied*, under the title of *The Song of Songs*, changing the scenes to New York City and Atlantic City. Sudermann had wisely decided that the scenes were too detached for dramatic treatment, and he was justified by Sheldon's adaptation.

In *The Garden of Paradise* (1914), however, Sheldon proved that he is a poet. It is not only the exquisite lyric grace of the songs, it is the imaginative power which turned the abstractions of Hans Andersen's story of *The Little Mermaid* into real characters. Swanhild, the mermaid who loves human life, becomes a woman, bartering her hopes of three centuries of the sea for a brief season of love and an immortal soul. She saves the King from the wreck and the static story becomes dynamic in Sheldon's vigorous picture of the race through the dark waters until she brings the King safe to the shore by the convent.

The ensuing scene, which is given in barest outline in the fairy story, develops into drama in the contrast of human love with the passion of Swanhild. The young girls chant a lyric that demands musical accompaniment:

A voice in the wind that blows
From the land beyond the sea
Has sung to every rose
The song it sings to me—
To the white rose on my breast,
To the butterflies and bees,
To the little birds that nest
Among the apple trees—
"I bring you joy and sorrow,
Rain and sunshine, everything,
I shall have fled to-morrow—
I am Love! I am Spring!"

EDWARD SHELDON

The dark girl, who is really the Queen of the Southland, finds the young King, half drowned, and Swanhild has to watch while he wakes to find himself in the Queen's arms. She thinks he is a mere sailor: he thinks she is a poor girl—after an exquisite love scene under the shadow of the statue of the little god, they part.

Swanhild wins the charm from the Sea Witch which will turn her into a human being, but she must pay the price. If the King loves her and marries her all is well; if she fails, she must return to the Sea Witch to become a toad and to serve her forever. Sheldon deepens the horror of the original scene by his conception of the Sea Witch, who is just an ordinary fairy in Andersen, but here becomes a lovely though terrible monster, and he excites our sympathy by his creation of the mermaidens, turned into toads, who try to warn their sister of her coming fate. There are faint suggestions of the Three Witches of *Macbeth* in this scene, but on the whole, it is original, and it is one of the very best of its kind. The Little Mermaid had to sacrifice her tongue in the story, but Sheldon wisely restores it to her, for her dialogue with the King when she has turned herself into a woman is natural, yet touched delicately with the hopelessness and dignity of love that is not returned. The King longs for the girl he has seen on the island and yet, for state reasons, he agrees to marry the Queen of the Southland. She, too, has had her dreams and is about to fly from her approaching suitor, when Swanhild, out of her great love for the King, persuades the Queen to wait to see him. This scene vibrates with the contrast of dawning and fading hope, and is entirely of Sheldon's creation, as is the preceding one, in which Swanhild learns of the King's love for the dark maiden of his dreams. The bridal night scene is sumptuous in its splendor, and Swanhild guards them outside the tent. Her sisters come to offer her the knife with which to kill the King and thereby buy her freedom from the Witch. But she flings the knife into the sea and leaps after it, to meet her doom. As in the fable, however, her love and sacrifice have given her a soul, and

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the Witch is baffled while Swanhild mounts to her place in Heaven.

To the great loss of our dramatic literature, Edward Sheldon has suffered for some years from an illness which has allowed him to work only at intervals. Outside of adaptations which he has not acknowledged, he has worked with collaborators in at least two plays, and the difficulty of assigning his share in them is increased by his modest attitude toward his own work.

The Lonely Heart (1921) is the study of the kind of character Sheldon loves to draw, the emotional, charming artist, whose life is a constant struggle between the desire for pleasure and the aspiration for better things. With his usual courage in daring the close approach to the sentimental he presents us four scenes in the life of Patrick Alexander Trelawney. The first is laid in 1864 in his childhood, starved for lack of sympathy, when the vision of his dead young mother comes to comfort him at Christmas Eve. She reappears at each of the crises of his life, at college in 1860, in his artist's cabin in 1885, where he gives up his carefully planned plot to make a young girl his mistress, and finally in 1915 when, a broken old man, he sacrifices his claim to his one hold on life, his little grandson, and dies. The best scenes are the first and last, for no one could witness without sympathy the efforts of the sophisticated little grandson to take care of his drunken but still dignified guardian in their sordid surroundings.

Bewitched (1924), in which Sheldon collaborated with Sidney Howard, is pure romance. An American aviator, cruising about in France after the war, falls near the Château de Magny and partakes of the hospitality of the Marquis de Magny. He dreams, inspired by the tapestry upon the walls. In this vision he falls in love with Jeannette, the daughter of a sorcerer of medieval days, and escapes only after the most alluring temptations. The skill with which the authors establish the atmosphere of the sorcerer's house, and interpret the conflict between the aviator's love and his desire to return to his own world, made the play significant. There are flashes

EDWARD SHELDON

of insight in *Bewitched* which reveal the playwright who lifts romance above the level of incident to the heights of character. When Jeannette rebels against her father's opposition to her growing love, and denounces the vampire (really herself) who is destroying the young men that come into the forest, he demands to know how she has learned this. She replies, "When I saw Jimmy, I think I knew everything in the world." Or another remark, of Alice Lea, the girl Jimmie had loved—"Men remember what happened; women remember how it happened"—reveals the quality of the dialogue which in these two instances may be credited to either Sheldon or Howard. It had an imaginative quality which won critical approval, but it did not attract New York audiences, though it ran to capacity houses in Cleveland.

In 1926 a melodrama, *Lulu Belle*, was produced by Belasco and announced as by Edward Sheldon and Charles MacArthur. There was a sordidness about this drama of a negro harlot's progress which was unlike anything else in Sheldon's original plays, and for which it would be idle to try to fix the responsibility. There was, however, a power in the portrayal of the devouring passion of George Randall, the negro who leaves wife and family at the call of Lulu Belle, to follow her even to Paris and to kill her in the end, which savored somewhat of his manner. There were moments, too, in the scenes in front of the tenements and in the café, which showed that the author of *Salvation Nell* had not lost his sense of the picturesque quality that may be obtained from the massing of human beings in surroundings that permit the maximum of emotional expression. But while *Salvation Nell* rose from degradation through suffering to a spiritual height and carried her lover with her, Lulu Belle dragged hers down to the bottom into which she fell herself. More important, the sympathy of the audience was won for Nell: it was never with Lulu Belle and rarely with George Randall, and there was no exaltation in witnessing his struggles, for the object of his desire was beneath him.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

In reviewing the work that is his alone, it would seem at first glance that Sheldon was merely experimenting in various forms. But from *Salvation Nell* to *The Garden of Paradise*, at least, there is a consistency not prohibitive of the freedom that belongs to any artist. He is the celebrator of the aspiration of those who strive to lift themselves out of circumstances or a mode of life to something higher, and his sympathy is always with them, even if they are doomed to disappointment from the beginning. *Salvation Nell* rises through awakened faith in God to a moral regeneration. Philip Morrow, thrown into the depths of racial degradation, climbs upon his agony to the achievement of a great tolerance for the race he had despised. Michael Regan wins the love of a woman who represents concretely the refinement and the purity he worshipped and which he knew he had missed. Mary Page not only leaves the farm in pursuit of a dream of beauty, but, when she finds that dream illusive, conquers her own past and grows in moral stature through her sacrifice. Rita Cavallini recognizes clearly the bliss she longs for in the love of Tom Armstrong, and just as resolutely puts it aside for a principle she has only just begun dimly to understand. Even *The Song of Songs* celebrated the longing for love that might exalt, and in *The Garden of Paradise* the desire of Swanhild passed the borders of the supernatural in her aspiration for human love, finer, even in its brevity, than the interminable contentment of the sea.

In this general attitude of sympathy with the aspiring soul, Sheldon points forward to Eugene O'Neill. But as in O'Neill the poet dominates the dramatist, so in Sheldon the playwright limits or at least defines the poet's power. That is why *The Garden of Paradise* is an advance upon *Salvation Nell* and why the fate that prevents the unhampered expression of Edward Sheldon's talent is so great a loss to the drama in America.

It would be a violation of confidence to record here the many instances in which Sheldon has been the unacknowledged collaborator with other playwrights or has adapted from other

EDWARD SHELDON

literature plays which have made wide popular appeal. On account of a modesty that must be respected this contribution cannot here be discussed. But if the truth were really known he would be more fully recognized not only as a playwright of originality but also as one who has inspired actors of prominence by providing them with plays which revealed to them and the public talents that otherwise might have been unsuspected. While our drama has been celebrated as the abode of "little people," it is the function of the historian to record and emphasize the ability which has never lost sight of the fact that in the theatre the touchstone of genius is the creation of power. Even in his failures, there was daring and mastery of all the resources of the theatre.

For Edward Sheldon is essentially a playwright. From his earliest youth he dramatized life, largely through his imagination. He has observed life carefully, it is true, and he has appreciated the aid which a realistic setting affords to a romantic theme. But on the whole he is best when he trusts to that imagination in the creation of beauty.

CHAPTER XVII

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

THERE is nothing easier than to give a play a bad name and hang it. How often, after an evening in which a playwright has entertained, surprised and even thrilled us for a few moments, do we reward him by shamefacedly remarking to our semi-profound friends, "Oh, yes, it was an interesting play, but of course it was only a melodrama." It is partly the critical rage for classification that besets us. We think we know tragedy and comedy, but we do not know what to do with the vast body of plays which lie between these categories. We call them all melodrama, and then after an attempt to include *Fine Feathers* and *Rain* in the same category, perhaps the thought begins to dawn upon us that there is fine melodrama and poor melodrama. Tragedy exalts; comedy entertains. But there are times when we wish neither to have our souls exalted nor to have our weaknesses exposed. We wish to have our attention caught and held by interesting situations and capable dialogue, and we wish to have above all that element of intense suspense which is the heart and soul of melodrama. So we are willing to give the playwright freedom. He may play upon that profoundest impulse of our nature, the instinct of self-preservation, and the hero or heroine may be in danger all the time. We have progressed beyond the point when we demand a happy ending, but we do want the ending to be "satisfactory." The word is again quoted from Bronson Howard, who could write good melodrama when he chose to do so.

For melodrama has its own laws not so clearly felt but still real. When any artist deliberately frees himself from certain

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

restrictions, he either takes on others or he observes faithfully the ones he preserves. We are willing to forgive the writer of melodrama if he heightens the sentiment or even exaggerates the passion. But not only must he make the ending satisfactory to us; he must also provide situations that are well knit together—the action must be sustained, and the illusion of probability must be preserved. For remember, it is an illusion. The older melodrama demanded neither probability nor possibility, but the new melodrama demands the first. The appeal of “soft music,” brought in to lull our critical judgment to sleep, to rouse our emotions so that they would forgive absurdity, is no longer needed in the new art of melodrama. It is no longer satisfied with mere situations; it attempts character drawing and even concerns itself with the social problems of the day.

With such definition of the melodrama, we can be concerned only with its outstanding examples. During the Nineteenth Century melodrama of the poorer variety satisfied the demand which, since the advent of the moving picture, has been met by that institution.

The older melodrama which held the stage by reason of the sincerity of its portraiture of character as well as by the vividness of its situations is exemplified by *In Old Kentucky*, by Charles T. Dazey (1855—), a native of Illinois, who realized the possibilities of the Kentucky mountaineer in drama. Dazey knew Kentucky well. He was educated at the College of Arts in Lexington before he entered Harvard, where he was the class poet of 1881. He had the usual difficulties in obtaining an opportunity, until finally *In Old Kentucky* was produced by the stock company at the Grand Opera House in St. Paul, Minnesota, in June, 1893. The play was performed for twenty-seven consecutive seasons in New York or on the road. It was based on personal observation, and Walter Scott's contrasts of the highlander and lowlander suggested to Dazey a contrast between the mountaineer and the “blue grass people.” The great success of *In Old Kentucky* was

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

due not only to the plot, which is a skillful succession of fights and accusations of murder, culminating in a horse race. This race was suggested to Dazey by witnessing the actions of a Puritanical Kentucky woman who became wildly excited over a contest which she hoped would be won by her son's entry. Dazey made from her the character of Aunt Aleathea. But Madge, the mountain girl, is the central character, and the love story which develops between her and Frank Layson, a young patrician, ends in her riding his horse to win the race, the "Ashland Oaks," for him. That she runs the risk of losing his love by appearing in public in the riding breeches which the traditions of his class made it impossible for a gentlewoman to don, provides a striking climax for the third Act. But the secret of the combined appeal of *In Old Kentucky* was Dazey's picture of the intense loves and hates which the primitive life of the mountaineers made plausible. The emotion is heightened by the process of making it more simple, and the improbabilities lie in the grouping of incidents rather than in the incidents themselves. Dazey continued to write plays for James O'Neill, Goodwin, Crane, and other leading actors, but none of them need detain us.

The transition from the older melodramas to the new is illustrated best by the work of George Broadhurst (1866-). His early successes in farce-comedy like *What Happened to Jones* (1897) and *Why Smith Left Home* (1899), despite their wide appeal, did not content him, for in *The Last Chapter* (1899) he made an attempt to do more serious work. In 1906 came *The Man of the Hour*, a play of political conditions. Alwyn Bennett, a young man of apparently easy-going nature, is elected mayor of a large city by the organization which believes it can control him. He acts independently of the boss, Richard Horigan, who is in league with the capitalist who has financed the campaign. The usual methods of coercion and blackmail are tried in vain, and Alwyn wins in his fight against corruption. What made the play the best Broadhurst has done was the character drawing, not only of the young

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

mayor, who drops his indifference when occasion for real effort arises, but even better, that of Phelan, the politician, by whose practical knowledge he circumvents the combination against him. Phelan is one of the few real politicians in the drama, and it may be that Broadhurst in his picture of the alliance between a man of education, independent through his fortune and position, and a practical politician, who is inspired by loyalty to his chief and animosity to his rival, has presented the only real solution for our political difficulties. Probably the strength and weakness of Broadhurst showed most clearly in *Bought and Paid For* (1911). The central theme, the marriage of a girl telephone operator to a rich self-made man, who drinks too much and who insists upon his marital rights, even breaking down the door of his wife's room as a climax to the second Act, was only mildly effective. It illustrated, however, one of the reasons why melodrama so often fails to respond to the test of permanent worth. The play was evidently built up for that scene, and an essentially improbable character of the wife was created to provide it. Plays of real value are not created for any one scene; they spring from the study of character. What saved the play and indeed turned it into a success, was the character of James Gilley, the brother of the wife, who is an amusing boaster and whose own keen interest in his return to prosperity brings about the reconciliation. This part, played by Frank Craven, is a type caricature, and illustrates again the quick response of this form of appeal. Indeed, the line between the melodrama and the comedy-type play is easily crossed.

Broadhurst's plays leave one with a sense of ability directed too constantly to the immediate return of the box office. Occasionally as in *The Price*, a sturdy melodrama, he leaves the heroine, who has secured her happiness at the cost of her employer's life, in a very insecure position, and paints a picture of wifely revenge which is powerful and perhaps original. The scene in which Ethel Bristol, knowing her own guilt, has to listen to Mrs. Dole read from her late husband's diary an ac-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

count of his relations with Ethel, until she forces Ethel to a confession, is very effective. But the effect is heightened when Ethel reads the diary later and finds that Mrs. Dole has herself interpolated the passage that wrung out of her rival her avowal of guilt. In *The Law of the Land* (1914) after building up an appealing situation in which a wife who has been hounded into killing her husband, is saved from detection by the loyalty of her lover, her secretary, and her manservant, Broadhurst precipitates the play into farce by the action of the police inspector, who abandons the case apparently because he is the father of twins!

Of less merit than Broadhurst's plays, the melodramas written by Charles Klein (1867-1915) were among the most successful of the first decade of the new century. Born in England, he belongs to our dramatic history mainly by the fact that his plays were concerned frequently with themes of contemporary life in the United States. He had a theory of play writing which was higher than his practice.¹

Practically all his plays seem written with the "big act" in mind. *The Lion and the Mouse* (1905) was prompted by his visit to the United States Senate. He drew in it the situation in which a girl, by becoming the private secretary of a magnate, saves her father, a judge of the Supreme Court, from certain financial interests that are attacking him. The scenes between Shirley Rossmore and Ryder have a certain power, but the characters are artificial. In *Daughters of Men* (1906) a capital and labor play, he points to the compromise suggested by Patrick McCarthy, the union leader, as the only way out. *The Third Degree* (1909) is based on the practice of the police in questioning criminals after arrest, and while realistic from

¹ "First comes the central idea of the play, then by a natural process the evolution of the characters needed for the exposition of the idea, then the sequence of events growing out of the conflict of the characters and last the unfolding of the story, consequent upon the conflict of temperaments. This is the natural order of development and that is one reason why melodramas are unnatural. The order of their development is to write the big act first and make everything else subservient. Mechanics receive first consideration and the characters are mere puppets bobbing about at the will of the monarch Mechanics."—*Theatre Magazine*, VI (1906), p. 159.

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

this point of view, is highly improbable and inconclusive. *The Gamblers* (1910) is a tense melodrama which deals with the conventional methods of finance that obtain on the stage. *The Next of Kin* (1909) strikes a lighter note, though the heroine is in danger of being sent to an insane asylum in order that her guardian may obtain her money. In *Maggie Pepper* (1911) he drew an extraordinary young woman, who at twenty-eight instructs her employers how to conduct a department store. These plays are all theatrically effective but they do not stand the test of analysis. His earlier sentimental successes like *The Music Master* (1904) are even less worthy of attention. The success of Broadhurst and Klein prompted others into the same field and all through the decade theatrical history is replete with the names of plays which made heroes or villains out of "captains of industry" or their opponents. Few of them survive, but the work of at least one man merits some scrutiny for he worked sincerely even if at times with unworthy material.

Eugene Walter (1874—) was born in Cleveland, Ohio, and had a varied experience in newspaper work in New York City, in the Middle West, and in Seattle. He also learned the theatrical business, "ranging," he says, "from minstrels and circuses to symphony orchestras and grand opera companies." He began writing with the new century, his *Serjeant James* being put on in Boston in 1902, and running for two weeks. But he first attracted attention with *The Undertow* (1907), a play of politics, railroads and newspaper life. Then came *Paid in Full* (1908), a study of the weakness of human nature in conflict with circumstances and with stronger natures. Joe Brooks, the clerk in the steamship company who steals money from his employer, Captain Williams, ostensibly to give his wife more comfort but really because he is a discontented weakling, is contrasted with Emma, who is the best character in the play. She is not the usual stage heroine, for she is a normal woman who dislikes housework but does it, and who, when her husband's defalcation is discovered, meets the situation effec-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

tively without heroics. Joe, driven into a corner by Williams' unexpected return, begs Emma to go to the captain and make terms. Full of contempt for him, Emma does so, expecting little, for the brutal character of Williams is well known. This scene made the fortune of the play. Captain Williams, instead of demanding the price which she anticipated, lets her husband resign with a clean slate and tells her he does so because he knows there are just two kinds of women, the good and the bad, and it is worth \$19,000 to him to find out that she is the right kind. There is an essential falsity in this scene, for nothing in Captain Williams' character as portrayed earlier in the play warrants his action. But Walter was playing a sure card, for audiences like the moral contrast which the generosity of a hard man provides, and it does not need the author's statement that he drew the character from Jack London and Rudyard Kipling to recognize the touch of their ancestor, Bret Harte. That *Paid in Full* is a melodrama is shown by Walter's own analysis of it.¹

Walter next wrote a successful melodrama of the Canadian woods, *The Wolf* (1908), in which he combined scenic realism, even to the reproduction of the howling of wolves from phonographic records taken in the Zoölogical Garden, with the excitement of a pursuit and a struggle in the dark between the lover and the villain. *The Easiest Way* (1908) has been hailed as a great example of realism and an epoch-making play. It is neither, but is rather a skilfully contrived melodrama, in which Walter had the courage to run the motive through to an unhappy ending, and the skill to preserve the suspense until that climax. He carefully presents us in the published play with an analysis of each of the characters up to the point at which they enter the drama. To anyone who has seen the play, these descriptions come as a surprise, for the three major

¹ *How to Write a Play*, Chaps. IV and V. "When the curtain descends on Williams, acknowledging gratification for performing a good deed, the result has been attained. There are a few broken threads to be tied together and that requires a short act . . . [but] . . . this act is essentially an anti-climax." In other words the play has been built up to one scene, and the characters have been motivated to its effect instead of determining it.

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

characters, Laura Murdock, Willard Brockton, and John Madison, do not conform to them. It would seem as though Walter, having built up a play out of situations, had then imagined the characters he would have liked to put in them. Or perhaps having had his original conception of the characters altered by the demands of production, he consoled himself by putting in print his implicit defense. Laura Murdock, the mistress of Willard Brockton, is the central character, and any claim the play may have to realism, stands or falls with her. As portrayed with skill by Frances Starr, she was essentially inconsistent, and the text of the play left the actress no alternative. The Laura of the first Act was refined and charming, giving up a prospect of luxury for a love for John Madison, which is to elevate and purify her. She keeps up her heroic and virtuous attitude nearly through the second Act, when the accumulated miseries of life in a second-rate boarding house in New York, and the schemes of Brockton, drive her back into his protection. She is weak enough not to keep up the struggle upon which she and Madison have agreed as a test of her fitness to marry him, when he shall make his fortune, and she is treacherous enough not even to send the letter which Brockton insists upon her writing to Madison when she returns to her earlier paramour. From this time on she runs true enough to the conception of her character as Walter outlines it in his introduction, and her final futile gesture toward suicide after Madison's return and discovery of her relapse, is also quite in keeping. But the heroic and spiritual Laura of Acts I and II is not the Laura of Acts III and IV, and the reason is not far to seek. If Walter had appeared on the stage and read his introduction, there would have been no play. The audience is led to sympathize with Laura because of her girlishness, her deep love for Madison, her apparent regeneration, and in real life Laura Murdock would not have had these qualities or been capable of this emotion. Walter has been clever enough to create a sentimental fallacy which for purposes of the theatre worked well, but to speak of the play as a forward step in realism is

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

to misuse the word. It is the old theme of the moral contrast which Bret Harte used so often, but the keener eye of the master would have smiled at Laura. He drew harlots who were brave, who were generous, who could starve themselves to death, but he did not draw them as "girlish" and he did not permit any one of them to say to a colleague whose professional career had been uninterrupted, "I don't see how you dare show your face to a decent woman."¹ In short, he was not absurd. Brockton is more consistent, but his conscientious attitude toward Madison is also overstrained, considering the devices he uses to regain Laura. His entrance into her flat, in which he shows his relation to her by the possession of the latchkey, has been praised by those who have forgotten Pinero's *Iris* or Daly's still earlier adaptation of *Madeleine Morel*.

In *Fine Feathers* (1913) Walters almost rose out of melodrama. This is a sincere treatment of the unsuccessful struggle of an individual against the temptations of modern life. These temptations in the case of Bob Reynolds are made concrete in his wife, Jane, whose desire for fine clothes and whose response to the general urge of feminine competition lead him to dishonesty, disgrace and suicide. The offer of John Brand, the contractor, to bribe Bob, who is an inspecting chemist, to permit the substitution of an inferior grade of cement in the new bridge, is at first refused; then, when Jane enters into the conspiracy against his honor, he weakens and accepts the forty thousand dollars. Walter, unlike the older school of melodrama, knows the modern methods of business, and he skillfully draws the net around Bob. Brand leads him into speculation, sells him, through his broker, stock in a weak concern, and recoups himself for the money he has paid Bob. When the latter turns on him and announces his intention of confessing his share in the transaction, Brand again stops him by reminding him that Jane is an accessory before the fact and will go to jail also. Bob's character runs true to form. There is not enough steel in him to meet his crisis alone. He drinks

¹ *The Easiest Way*, Act II.

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

brandy to give himself courage and defies Brand—and Jane and he in a flash of mutual tenderness and understanding come to a realization of their common responsibility. Then, when it seems that possible happiness opens for them, the dam breaks on account of the weak cement and hundreds of lives are lost. Brand and Dick Meade, the friend who has been the concrete representative of a saner philosophy of life, urge them to run for Europe, but Bob has the combination of courage and weakness which takes him out of the situation with a bullet through his head. The suicide is logical and inevitable. *Fine Feathers* was Walter's last significant play. He made an attempt in *A Plain Woman* (1912) to dramatize a recent divorce suit in which a captain of industry forgot the wife who had helped him in his youth. But his skill was spent in adaptations of John Fox's stories of the mountaineers or in frank melodramas like *The Knife* (1917). Melodrama, after all, is his natural method.

The crest of the wave of melodrama which dramatized current events came about the end of the first decade. Naturally it was from the newspaper offices that playwrights were recruited. Usually their work has dropped below the level which requires our attention, but occasional plays at least need mention. Joseph Medill Patterson (1879-) and Harriet Ford drew a vivid, if exaggerated picture of a newspaper office and composing room in *The Fourth Estate* (1909). The background was more veracious than the leading character, a managing editor who commits suicide because he cannot carry to its finish his fight against corruption, a climax which was later changed to suit popular demand for a happy ending. In *Rebellion* (1911), Patterson illustrated the futility of religious discussion upon the stage. The audiences which watched Georgia Connor struggle to decide whether to divorce her drunken husband and remarry, in defiance of her belief as a Catholic, or to suffer while carrying out her marriage vow, remained generally cold, because to those who believed as she did, the elaborate arguments of Father Hervey left out the one

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

supreme argument, while to those who were not Catholics, there seemed no problem at all. Probably the most powerful of the plays which attacked a form of religious belief was *Polygamy*, (1914) by Harvey O'Higgins and Harriet Ford. The difficulty of the individual who is caught in the net of Mormonism was skilfully drawn and the plight of the husband who is forced into infidelity against his will might have been even more tragic if a way out had not been found at the last moment.

The mechanics of melodrama were given a new turn in *On Trial* (1914), by Elmer Reizenstein (now Rice), a murder mystery which interrupted the progress of a court trial by enacting certain scenes which the witnesses have just started to describe. The result on the stage was certainly striking and the principle on which it was based has been adopted in several plays since that time. When *On Trial* was first produced, the prophecy was freely made that it would revolutionize play writing, but it has not done so. The "cutback" was of course suggested by the moving picture and the moving picture can produce the effect so much more easily than the play that dramatists have usually wisely left the field to their rival. Rice has not maintained his reputation as a playwright, and in *The Adding Machine* (1923) he descended into a sordid analysis of human life and an absurd description of heaven, couched in terms of exaggeration and so-called impressionism, which for a short time deceived some critics as to its importance.

Indeed while freedom has been one of the qualities of melodrama, it is not often that it attracts the pioneer in matters of form. It may introduce new devices like the smokeless pistol of *Within the Law*, but the authors of successful plays of this category usually rely on the well-established principles by which intensity of impression may be secured. The melodrama passed from a scrutiny of our economic and political institutions to an analysis of crime and its detection, and a deluge of "crook" plays ensued to which we need pay little attention. Indeed it never left this field, and occasionally, as in *Leah Kleschna* (1904) by C. M. S. McLellan, the character drawing



Oliver Faint

THE HEIGHT OF MELODRAMA

rose above the usual level. McLellan, who under the name of Hugh Morton had won popular success with *The Belle of New York*, attempted to portray sincerely the regeneration of a girl thief through the power of a man whom she loves, and if she is not altogether convincing, the play even yet bears reading better than many of its kind. Mrs. Fiske made a signal success in the part, both at home and abroad. The difficulties of the American playwright are reflected in the preface which records McLellan's protest against having to write a fifth Act to provide a happy ending when the play was complete at the end of the fourth.

Even the interminable succession of melodramas with a "gunman" as the hero achieve occasionally a character portrayal of some reality. Porter Emerson Browne's *The Bad Man* (1920) despite its improbabilities, caused a hearer to think, for in the action of Pancho Lopez, who applies to the usual triangle the quick methods of solution of a Mexican bandit, we may sense a reason for the continued misunderstanding of the two countries. When two races dislike each other for their virtues, it is almost a hopeless matter. *Seventh Heaven*, by Austin Strong (1922), a romantic melodrama laid in Paris, gave Helen Menken an opportunity for one of the most vivid scenes in the contemporary drama. The picture of Diane, animated by her love for Chico to a courage that enables her to defy the tyranny of years, was fine melodrama. One of the best of recent melodramas was *Twelve Miles Out* (1925), by William Anthony McGuire, for the character of Michael McCue, the modern pirate, was outstanding, and the purpose the author had in writing, the attack upon intolerance, is clear and yet not too evident.

At this moment the melodrama seems to be progressing not so much in the direction of probability as in that of rapidity. In *Broadway* (1926) and *Chicago* (1926) the tempo is keyed up to the intense rhythm of contemporary life. The picture of a night club in the former has photographic reality, of course, but the plot is as old as the French *mélodrame* of the

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Eighteenth Century. The four stock figures, the heroine who is better than her surroundings, the hero, who has "honest intentions" toward her, the villain, who would delude her, and the detective, who circumvents the villain, are old friends. Even the one appealing note, that of the professional pride of the variety actors who "do their act" even if their hearts are breaking, has been anticipated by Sheldon and others. *Chicago* differed from *Broadway* in its satiric intent. The methods by which a murderess not only is saved from execution, but is made a heroine through the efforts of her attorney and the newspapers, are correct. There is a delightful touch at the end, when just as the acquitted murderess is posing for her picture, a shot is heard and all her admirers run off to pay court to the newest sensation!

But in the history of the drama, such plays are mere episodes, to be forgotten because they do not advance the art at all. The characters are not even as veracious as those of *In Old Kentucky*; they are only more active. They are as far from sounding the profounder realities of life as the daily newspaper from which they take their inspiration. Of all dramatic forms they fade most quickly, for they pay the price of their seizure of contemporary interest by certain oblivion.

CHAPTER XVIII

COMEDY TYPES AGAIN

PERHAPS the most persistent of the impulses that have made our drama continuous in its history, has been the effort to present types of character, whose primary purpose is the creation of laughter. From the two Jonathans in *The Contrast* and *The Forest Rose*, through the work of Harrigan and Hoyt, the tradition passed on unbroken to George Ade and George Cohan. Generally the type has tended to caricature, there has been an overemphasis upon certain qualities in the leading character, usually written for a star, and while the lessons Herne and Thomas taught our playwrights have not passed unnoticed, the species has never risen to the permanent worth of our social comedy, our serious domestic drama, or our romance. Yet because of its portrayal of American types and because of its great success in the theatre, it demands consideration.

When George Ade (1866-) began to write his comedies at the beginning of the Twentieth Century they were hailed as a new departure. But there is little really original in his choice of material or method of treatment. Ade has expressed his conception of play writing as an attempt to treat of American life "without slandering my own countrymen or holding them up to ridicule."¹ It is true that his satire is kindly rather than searching, but there are certainly ridiculous types in all his plays and the general effect is similar to that of Hoyt, who was undoubtedly his model. Ade has written at least seventeen plays, including musical comedies like *The Sultan of Sulu* (1902) and *The Sho-gun* (1904), and he continued his dra-

¹ "George Ade talks of his Stage Ideals," *Theatre Magazine*, IV (1904) 287-8.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

matic work until 1914, but final judgment must rest upon the popular successes produced between 1903 and 1908.

The County Chairman (1903) is a study of the human politician in a small town in Indiana. The Honorable Jim Hackler, the county chairman, is the hero. As is usual with Ade, the minor characters establish the atmosphere of the town and provide rather obvious comedy. The plot is of no real significance. What carried the play was the character study of Jim Hackler, who represents the politician that dominates his town by his personality, and who, while believing in organization, has the saving grace of decency which marks him out from the herd. In *The College Widow* (1904) Ade presented a picture of Atwater College, evidently in the Middle West. All the types, from the president down to the waiters, are highly exaggerated and represent the most obvious features of college life. There is a trainer, a football coach, and a postgraduate tutor who is drawn after the stage professor of fifty years before, and the whole college atmosphere seems to be written from the point of view of an outsider. This is not due to ignorance on Ade's part, for he is a graduate of Purdue University and has been a trustee, but to the inherent weakness of the comedy of exaggeration. There is, indeed, some shrewd comment on modern athletics implicit in the conversation of the characters. The College Widow, Jane Witherspoon, the daughter of the president, is fairly well drawn, and Bill Bolton, the half-back hero, is not too heroic to be acceptable in comedy. But the play verges on farce all the time and any real interpretation of college life is nonexistent. What carried the play was the clever conversation and the continuous bustle.

Just Out of College (1905) is a satire on the college man who has nothing that is available from his education to sell in the business world. Edward Swinger, who has gone through college with a tennis racquet, tries to marry Caroline Pickering, the daughter of Septimus Pickering, who is in the pickle industry. Pickering loans him twenty thousand dollars, and Edward invests it in the pickle business without his prospective

COMEDY TYPES AGAIN

father-in-law's knowledge, and of course makes money by it. The conversation is undoubtedly clever, but when it does not verge on slang, it is slang. *Father and the Boys* (1908) is laid in New York City; at a race course; and at the Eldorado Hotel near Goldfields, Nevada. It is a contrast between Lemuel Morewood, a wool broker, and his two sons, who let him see that they consider him a "back number." He tries to prove the contrary and succeeds. In it Crane had a congenial character part. It is difficult, and perhaps unnecessary, to tell the plot of one of Ade's plays, because the plot, after all, is not the important matter. What carried the plays was the snap of the dialogue, the hard, highly colored caricature, and an eternal optimism, with a shrewd comment on life. Ade also wrote a number of one-act plays, including *Marse Corington*, *The Mayor and the Manicure*, *Speaking to Father*, and *Nettie*, which partake of the same characteristics as the longer plays. In fact, *Speaking to Father* is a section of *Just Out of College*.

While the work of George M. Cohan (1878—) belongs to the same category as that of George Ade, there are certain differences, due to their training. Cohan, in his autobiography, reveals his limitations and also his genius for the theatre. If one feels that Ade was capable of better things than he accomplished, there is the impression that Cohan has developed his talent to its fullest extent. His education has been almost entirely in the theatre, and he has acquired a sense of what is theatrically effective, probably unexcelled, except by Belasco. He is more inclined to the melodrama than Ade, but the plays of both are based upon the principle of the variety show, the deliberate planting of the remark for the sake of the answer. There is an imaginative quality at times in Cohan's work to which Ade does not aspire, and there is an emotional element, shown in his work in music, which is seen for better or for worse in his plays.

It would be idle to chronicle his work completely. He has been on the stage since the age of nine, and his play writing began with vaudeville. He learned his art in the eighties and

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

nineties and to those who saw *The Governor's Son* in 1901 and *American Born* in 1926 there was no essential difference in kind between the two, except that one was accompanied by music and the other was not. There is, however, a difference in degree of artistic effectiveness in Cohan's plays. *Forty-five Minutes From Broadway* (1906) is a farce, with an impossible plot, and the stage law of the eighties. In *Get-Rich-Quick Wallingford* (1910), however, he made out of the stories by George Randolph Chester, one of the most successful plays of the day and a skillfully constructed piece of stage art. J. Rufus Wallingford, the adventurer who with his companion, "Blackie" Daw, makes a fortune out of covered carpet tacks and wakes up to find himself honest, typifies success at any price, and his wide appeal may be a criticism of the public that applauded him or it may be a criticism of the reality of the playwright and his fictional model. To be sure, the final curtain is brought down upon the reformed Wallingford's remark, "What a fool a man is for being a crook." But in any event the type play does not convince; and audiences are quite willing to be amused by dishonesty and even to applaud it, because they do not take it seriously. The student of stage technique may profit, however, by a consideration of the means by which Cohan secured his effects, especially in the first Act. Wallingford is kept off the stage until his picture, endowed by "Blackie" Daw with the quality of success, is mirrored in the consciousness of the leading citizens of Battlesburg, and his entry and the impression he makes upon his prospective victims are both based on an instinctive knowledge of human psychology.

In *Broadway Jones* (1912) there was expressed a sympathy for human joy and suffering that raised the play above the average of Cohan's work. The revelation to the young spendthrift that his responsibility for the business which had been left to him did not end with his mere decision to sell it, could not have been brought about so well if Cohan himself had not known the daily hazard of those whose margin of comfort is

COMEDY TYPES AGAIN

insecure. *Seven Keys to Baldpate* (1913) showed Cohan in one of his cleverest moods, though again he derived the idea from a story. One surprise follows another, until the audience, who have watched the wonderful collection of reporters, crooks and politicians and who believe they are in the secret, suddenly realize they have been tricked and that the whole thing is simply a story that Magee, a writer, has completed on a bet, at midnight. Everyone is a type and there is not a dull moment. There is a certain advance in characterization in *Hit the Trail Holliday* (1915) though it is so patently based on the career of "Billy Sunday" that it loses in part. The conception of a bartender taking the lead in a prohibition crusade is fundamentally comic.

The interest in *The Miracle Man* (1914) lay in the instinctive reaction of Cohan to the greater effect which a faith healer would exert on the audience if his influence were shown through the other characters and he were kept off the stage. In *Madeline and the Movies* (1922) Cohan attempted to repeat the device of *Seven Keys to Baldpate* by having what is apparently a moving picture turn out to be a vision of a butler who is longing to act. But the play did not succeed notwithstanding that Cohan himself went into the cast to save it. This action, not limited to the play in question, reveals the essentially incomplete nature of his art as a playwright, which depends so much upon his personality as an actor that they are almost inseparable. They almost made *The Song and Dance Man* (1923) a play of permanent value. In the part of John Farrell or "Hap," Cohan rose almost above the type to an individual character. In this variety actor, who cherished the belief that he was the best "song and dance man" in the profession, there is a wistful fancy that remains after the gun play and the rest depart. Farrell was the incarnation of the experience of Cohan the actor, and the picture of a second-rate variety "performer," drawn by one of the most successful in the history of the theatre, with the sympathy that success has apparently left unkilld, was very appealing. Here Cohan was

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

at home, while in *American Born* (1926) he was equally out of his element in an international contrast.

There is no final judgment as yet to be passed on Cohan's work, but in any such consideration, it must be remembered on the one hand that he has made his greatest successes by fashioning for the theatre material supplied by other hands and on the other that he has added something vital for the theatre in his treatment of that material.

James Forbes, a Canadian by birth, but a naturalized citizen since 1892, became a playwright after a long training in the theatre, as both actor and manager, and a varied newspaper experience. In *The Chorus Lady* (1906) and *The Show Shop* (1914) he drew situations with the background of the theatre, extremely effective on the stage, and couched in a witty dialogue which does not lose so much through the test of print as do his farce comedies of small town or suburban life, *The Travelling Salesman* (1908) and *The Commuters* (1910). There is a glamour about the stage pictures in *The Chorus Lady*, and a heroic sacrifice of one sister for another, strongly reminiscent of *One of Our Girls*, which gives it more permanent interest than the description of the "drummers" or the people in *The Commuters*, although the latter are more accurately painted. But all the characters are highly touched up, and to speak of any of them as veracious pictures of life is a mistake. Forbes did vastly superior work in the more difficult field of social drama in *The Famous Mrs. Fair*.¹

That the type play is distinctly less a matter of writing than of acting is illustrated by the series of plays in which Winchell Smith (1871-) has collaborated with a number of playwrights who it may be presumed contributed the story while one of the most expert stage directors of to-day contributed that element which secures success upon the stage. But wherever the play is laid the interest lies in the caricature. The small-town types in *The Fortune Hunter* (1909), the doctor and nurse in *The Boomerang* (1916), the really delightful

¹ See Chapter XV.

COMEDY TYPES AGAIN

board of trustees of a church in *Thank You* (1921), are farcical but interesting. The climax of absurdity was reached in *Turn to the Right* (1916) in which two crooks calmly marry into a respectable family with apparent general satisfaction. The height of Smith's success came with his association with the actor, Frank Bacon, in *Lightnin'*. Beginning August 26, 1918, this play ran for 1,291 consecutive performances, in New York, and it is significant that it broke the record held, for over twenty years, by Hoyt's *A Trip to Chinatown*. *Lightnin'* secured its success through the remarkable acting of Bacon in the type part of "Lightnin' Bill Jones," a lovable ne'er-do-well, who drinks more than is good for him and has a delightful gift of exaggeration. He is the lineal descendant of Rip Van Winkle and of Mink Jones in *A Temperance Town*, his resemblance to the first being emphasized by his noble forgiveness of his wife who has taken care of him, and by his refusal to sign a deed to their hotel, just as Rip had declined to sign the transfer of his property. The resemblance was completed by Bacon's modeling of his acting on that of Joseph Jefferson.

To the same school of writing belong the comedies of Frank Craven, who indeed acted in *Artie*, one of Ade's comparative failures. Craven is a very competent actor, and he has taken the leading parts in his own plays. Beginning in 1914 with *Too Many Cooks*, which dealt with suburban types and the interference of relatives-in-law, he scored his greatest success in *The First Year* (1920) which ran for seven hundred and forty performances in New York, and in which he represented the difficulties of a bride and groom in the necessary adjustments of married life. Each character, from the principals and the father and mother of the bride, down to an extraordinary negro servant, is a highly colored chromo, and the business methods of the purchasing agent of the railroad through which the fortune of the young pair is made, are so absurd as to be irritating. Yet the hilarity was continuous and Craven's play rose above the mass by the human touch which led thousands to remember their own difficulties in a similar period of

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

life. There was a healthy tone in the depiction of the relations of father and son in *New Brooms* (1924), and in both this play and *Spite Corner* (1922) Craven appeared to be working out of the type play to a truer form of comedy. This he almost achieved in *Money From Home* (1927) a study of the girl who leaves her Pennsylvania Dutch home for an adventure in New York, and the young doctor, who after abandoning his profession to lead the life of a crook, resumes it by the instinctive response which an opportunity to save life offers him. Craven's art is evidently still in a formative state.

The type play naturally leads to the dramatization of current events, and this brings immediate attention and likewise emphasizes its temporary character. The automobile and the consequent extravagance of those who purchase it was satirized in a play, *Six Cylinder Love* (1921) by William Anthony McGuire, in which the character drawing was above the ordinary type casting in such plays. McGuire writes with a background of knowledge of the history of the drama, as evidenced by a thoughtful article on comedy recently published by him, and in such comedies as *I Wish I Was Rich* (1926) he gives evidence of ability which has not yet been fully expressed. The comic supplement is itself dramatized in *The Potters* (1923) by J. P. McEvoy, a graduate of Notre Dame University and a newspaper man. The efforts of "Pa" Potter, the head of a family of distinctly mediocre quality, to maintain his hold on life despite the pressure of his wife's desires, are set against a background of subways, lunch counters, Pullman cars, and back porches, which reflect observation of the surface of life.

The strength of the appeal of the type play, when written shrewdly and accurately timed, is illustrated by the career of *Abie's Irish Rose* which after a success in California began at the Fulton Theatre, New York, May 23, 1922, and was still running, after transfer to the Republic, in July, 1927. It is idle for the dramatic critic to dismiss such a play as unimportant. When any production on the stage, notwithstanding

COMEDY TYPES AGAIN

critical disapproval, makes such a continuous appeal, without salacious or spectacular elements, it behooves the historian to inquire into the reasons for the result. That it is the play which is responsible has been proved by the invariable success which has been met by each road company, no matter what the ability of the actors, none of whom have been of stellar rank. *Abie's Irish Rose* has succeeded because Anne Nichols has represented practically every form of love known to human beings. There is first, the love of a boy, Abraham Levy, and a girl, Rose-Mary Murphy, who have been married secretly, knowing the racial prejudice of their respective fathers. Next is the love of Solomon Levy and Patrick Murphy for their children; third, the love sanctified by memory, of the dead mothers of the young couple; and finally the love of the grandfathers for their twin grandchildren, through whom the reconciliation is brought about. There is thus secured an appeal to all ages and conditions, sharpened by the shrewdly conceived dialogue, which is based on the century-old principle of antithesis, and borrowed from the variety show. Miss Nichols wisely chose for the motive of prejudice the two races which probably feel most keenly any insult to their racial and religious instincts, and insults are hurled freely by Solomon Levy and Patrick Murphy at each other. Their sensitiveness makes for comedy, of course, but there is another element in *Abie's Irish Rose* which helped to secure its popular triumph. In 1922 the wave of intolerance which frequently comes after a war was sweeping over the country, and one of its forms was directed against the Jewish and the Irish Catholic elements in our population. Miss Nichols not only attacked this intolerance indirectly through her revelation of the absurdity of the fathers' prejudice, but she embodied in the characters of Father Whalen and Rabbi Samuels, through whom the reconciliation is effected, the opposite gospel of tolerance. Already the reaction against the germ of race hatred had set in, and if *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was a powerful weapon against slavery, *Abie's Irish Rose* has become important in our

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

social history as a potent force toward sanity of feeling in the Republic.

In view of the fact that when *Lightnin'* had to relinquish the record of continuous performances on Broadway, it was to *Abie's Irish Rose* that it handed the popular laurel it had taken from *A Trip to Chinatown*, it is futile to treat the type play from the usual academic attitude. English audiences view them with favor, partly in the spirit of a visit to a museum, and some of the most eccentric productions, like *Potash and Perlmutter*, succeed even in Germany. But to speak of the type play as realistic, is a mistake. It is, in the true sense of the word, the exact opposite, idealistic, in method. The characters are overstressed for purposes of comedy and their very success is determined frequently, though not universally, by their exaggeration. Yet they are of the very life of the theatre; their glaring colors are a reflex of the paint and the tinsel. Perhaps because their authors know the theatre so well, they are not concerned with its changing fashions. They write in the accepted formulas which have stood the test for centuries. Occasionally, as in *Rip Van Winkle*, *Lightnin'* or *Abie's Irish Rose*, they strike with unusual skill some of the universal notes which awaken human sympathy and the historian can only observe and record their triumph. But he must also insist that they enclose life with the material and machinery of the stage; they do not bring life in its fullness into the drama. Their best function has been the training of playwrights who like George Kelly have begun in this category, and have progressed to more profound studies of human conduct.

CHAPTER XIX

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

DRAMATIC history does not pay attention to the calendar, and in the case of romance, is unlikely to be identified in its progress with any movements or tendencies of the day. Yet the production of *Madame Butterfly* in 1900 does seem to mark a departure from the older school of heroic drama. Its response to the spirit of the new century was to reveal itself more in form than in material and even here we shall, at times, see a reversion to the older type. After the work of Long and Belasco the new romance was to find in Edward Sheldon its chief exponent. And yet there were fields he did not touch.

The sincerity of treatment, the skillfulness of technique show in an interesting way in the work of Edwin Milton Royle (1862-) who belongs to an older generation, and who has written for the stage since 1892. Royle's first play, *Friends* (1892), is a melodrama of the nineties, based on his knowledge of the lives of struggling musicians, opera singers and writers. But his *Squaw Man* (1905), one of the most successful plays of its day, illustrates the change of manner even within itself. The first Act, laid in England, is conventional melodrama, whose only excuse is the transfer of Captain James Wynnegate from his ancestral halls, through an act of self-sacrifice, to the plains of Wyoming. Royle was justified in making his hero an Englishman since he provided a more distinct contrast with the cowboys and "bad men" of the West, but more important, he made the central situation, the marriage between Wynnegate or "Jim Carson" as he has become, and Nat-uritch, the squaw who saves his life, more probable than it would

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

have been in the case of an American. What raised *The Squaw Man* above the level of the usual Western play is its fidelity to actual conditions. Once the romantic situation from the first Act is accepted, the realistic treatment of it during the rest of the play raises it out of melodrama. Royle determined to put the real Indian on the stage and he cast for the character of Baco White, the interpreter, a Ute Indian, through whom he secured an exact phonetic reproduction of the Ute dialect for the squaw Nat-u-ritch and her father, Tab-i-wana, the Peace Chief of the tribe, who was drawn from an Indian Royle had known during his stay in the West. But more important, he drew the Indian characters accurately. Nat-u-ritch never steps out of her position as the Indian squaw—indeed she speaks only half a dozen words, yet she carries on the play. Inarticulately she shoots the “bad man” who would have killed Carson; she kills herself just as simply when she sees that she stands between her husband’s return to England and their son’s future. The struggle in Captain Wynnegate’s soul between his longing to return with his son to England and to Diana Kerhill, and his gratitude to Nat-u-ritch, instead of being given to the audience in a soliloquy, as in the old heroic play, is conveyed in a conversation with the British solicitor who brings “Jim Carson” the news that he is an Earl. No one who has had a child can fail to understand the art with which Royle built up the scene of parting between the father and his little boy. But after all, the Indians are the best drawn. Tab-i-wana, on hearing that his daughter has gone off into the hills, makes no protest against her husband’s decision. “If she disobeys you, you beat her—if she disobeys again—kill her.” She is merely a squaw. But at Jim’s request, Tab-i-wana searches for her to tell her to keep away until the sheriff, who is looking for her, has disappeared. He brings back, however, the dead body of Nat-u-ritch, and the curtain goes down on the gaunt figure of the chief, with the limp body of his daughter lying across his arms, and with the new Lord Kervil and Lady Diana for the moment in the background of our interest. Royle al-

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

lowed his audiences to exercise their imaginations and thus carry the play with them in their sympathies. *The Squaw Man* ran a year in London and, without permission, was played in Paris and Berlin.

Royle's work is varied and uneven. In 1907 he attempted in *The Struggle Everlasting* a modern morality play, written with sincerity and with some strong scenes. The characters are abstractions or types, and the struggle between Mind and Soul for the supremacy over Body is quite convincing. The third Act in which Body, a courtesan, is visited one after another by the lovers who have been ruined by her, made a vivid appeal on the stage, for Royle drew her victims, the pugilist, the banker, and the tragedian, with skill. The episode of the great actor coming to tell her how his mind has faltered through her influence, until he forgets his lines and the curtain is rung down on him forever is memorable. Her utter lack of sympathy for anyone who has failed is in perfect keeping with her character. If Royle had run through to the end with the same quality, he might have made one of the great plays of the time.

The Unwritten Law (1913) is a reversion in treatment to pure melodrama, with some understanding, however, of the power of hypnotism, but in *Launcelot and Elaine* (1921), a dramatization of Tennyson's poem, Royle endeavored sincerely and with some success to transfer the spirit of Elaine's tragic passion to the stage. He used many of Tennyson's lines, but added a good deal of his own composition. It is interesting to note in the reading of the manuscript, how the trained actor, who had spent his first two years in Edwin Booth's Company, deliberately took frequent liberties with the supposed normal blank-verse line of five stresses, and gave his characters lines of two, three or four stresses as the sense dictated. He probably realized that audiences cannot tell (and do not care) whether the presupposed line unit is preserved. To them the recurrence of the accented syllable at fairly even time intervals is sufficient, without uniform measurement. The

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

verse gains in naturalness by this freedom, for the thought dictates the form instead of being forced into a metrical arrangement which is unfamiliar. The real difficulty with Elaine as a heroine lies in the lack of dramatic conflict in her story. There are opportunities for beautiful static scenes but that is all.

To the superficial observer, Booth Tarkington (1869-) may seem to belong to the writers of social drama. But as a playwright his material, even when it appears to be drawn from the life around him, is really born in his romantic fancy. His first play to reach the stage, *Monsieur Beaucaire* (1901), was a compound of his love of romance and his sense of social values, but it was the romantic flavor which, in the hands of Richard Mansfield, carried it into popular favor. The play, in which he collaborated with Evelyn G. Sutherland, has not the significance of the story from which it was derived. *Monsieur Beaucaire* lifted itself out of the vast number of historical novels which were published during the nineties, by its distinction of style and by the conception of the character of the French nobleman who after his adventure, doubly disguised, into the English society of the Eighteenth Century, left Lady Carlisle, who had failed to recognize his inherent nobility and returned to his own *milieu*. This note of the tragedy of disappointment was spoiled in the play by the happy ending, forced for the supposed taste of a public which would undoubtedly have accepted the logical conclusion of the story. American audiences were ready for tragedy as the success of *Nathan Hale* and *Barbara Frietchie* had proved. The play was a personal triumph for Mansfield, and as usual, all other parts were subordinated to his.

Although *The Man from Home* (1907) has been described as a realistic picture of the typical American, in contrast with European civilization, it is also purely romantic in its setting and in its conception of character. Daniel Voorhees Pike, the hero, who goes to Sorrento to look after his ward, Ethel Granger-Simpson, and who prevents her marriage with the

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

son of a British peer, is the average American only in so far as he lives near the center of population. He is a queer mixture of Colonel Manly and his servant, Jonathan, in our first comedy, *The Contrast*, which was also a study of American sincerity in contrast with British types. But how much more accurately Royall Tyler drew the American in 1789 before the stage convention of the type grew up and hardened into caricature! Perhaps there are citizens of Indiana who are as naïve and at the same time as shrewd as Pike, but while he is not so absurd as the caricatures of British aristocracy, he is quite incredible on the printed page. On the stage, however, William Hodge made a success in the character, and Tarkington and H. L. Wilson, his collaborator, provided an amusing if not important vehicle for him. Tarkington proceeded with *Cameo Kirby* (1909), a romance of old slavery days, *Your Humble Servant* (1909), in which Otis Skinner represented an actor, Lafayette Towers, which gave him an opportunity to depict the life on the road, and *Getting a Polish* (1910), in which May Irvin played the part of a Western widow who goes to Paris, presumably for culture. These, however, are not important. Inspired perhaps by a natural reaction against the prosaic life of the small city, and with his horizon broadened by his education at Princeton and his foreign travel, Tarkington has always had the urge to create the character of a human being who represents beauty. Knowing Italy quite well, he wrote for Otis Skinner a play, *Mr. Antonio* (1916), in which he contrasted the character of a simple Italian organ grinder with the selfishness of a small town in western Pennsylvania. There was little structure in the play but Skinner's presentation was highly successful. Tarkington has made several efforts to depict conditions as they are, but nearly always returns to the province he knows best. The beginning of *The Country Cousin* (1917), laid in Ohio, is quite faithful to life, but when he takes the heroine to New York the unreality of the conditions among which she is placed is apparent at once. *Clarence* (1919) was satire of a searching kind, and the efforts of the young entomol-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

ogist to straighten out the affairs of the family into which he is introduced were enlivened with a dialogue easily the most brilliant written by Tarkington. But the plot is farcical and even here the romance of adolescence, which in the characters of Bobby and Cora White found remarkable expression through the acting of Glenn Hunter and Helen Hayes, was one of the prime factors in the success. This was true also of *The Intimate Strangers* (1921) and the chance meeting of the hero and heroine in a railroad station at which they have to spend the night, is surely the romance which may be wrung out of familiar things. *Rose Briar* (1922) is even more frankly romantic, though Tarkington showed in it his uncanny knowledge of feminine nature, more adequately revealed in his fiction. That Tarkington is essentially a romanticist is shown clearly when he tries to build a play upon a capital and labor theme like *The Gibson Upright* (1919). The conversation between the owner of the factory and his employees takes place not in a business office, but in Tarkington's fancy. He is best in drama when he gives rein to that fancy, abandons effort to deal with ordinary conditions, and frankly takes his characters and situations into another time and place where he is freed from the limitations of accuracy. Then we have such a romance as *Beaucaire* or such one-act plays as *Beauty and the Jacobin* (1912) laid in the French Revolution, or *Bimbo the Pirate* (1926). Here he can let his imagination provide us with gallant men and beautiful women and "the ruffle's flutter and the flash of steel." Here he can indulge in his whimsical creation of delightful absurdities and occasionally, as in the characters of Clarence and of Bobby White, touch the routine of daily life with that spark of imagination which lifts *Clarence* far above the level of his usual attempts at reality. But we must not, in passing judgment upon Tarkington as a dramatist, allow ourselves to be confused by his excellence in depicting in his fiction certain phases of our life. As a novelist he thinks much more frequently in terms of real life. As a playwright he thinks in terms of the theatre and gives his

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

characters not actual but theatrical life. He therefore just fails, usually, to produce work of permanent value. Part of this failure may be due to the obvious fact that as a novelist he is in absolute control of his material, while as a playwright he is not. But my final impression after seeing many of Tarkington's plays, is that he takes the playwright's function much less seriously than he takes that of the novelist. This attitude toward the theatre is reflected in his story *Harlequin and Columbine* and it may be the solution, after all, of the problem, disconcerting to the critic, who sees Tarkington approach artistic success so often and not quite reach the mark.

It is a well-known phenomenon of the drama that plays upon similar themes or of like categories appear together. Whether it be due to the success of one play and consequent imitation, or to a general tendency based upon elements foreign to the theatre, is not always easy to determine. Certainly at the end of the first decade, examples of romance, having been comparatively few, began to multiply. That the artistic success of *The Piper* or *The Scarecrow* in the season of 1910-11 was in any way responsible is unlikely, for the romance took a shape different from either. The great success of *Kismet* in London, before its production in December, 1911, in New York may have brought about the production of other exotic romances, but it must be remembered that Belasco, Long, Tarkington, Tully, Royle and Sheldon had kept alive the general interest in romance during the first decade, and Long, in particular, had revealed the possibilities of romance in the East.

Richard Walton Tully (1877-) who was born in California and graduated from the University of California in 1901, represents the romance in its choice of exotic themes, in deliberate departure from a realistic picture of familiar life and in a sumptuous use of scenery and lighting, to produce at times a symbolic background. His association with Belasco in *The Rose of the Rancho* (1906), taught him how to employ the accessories of the stage and his *Bird of Paradise* (1912) was a production of which the beauty at least may be unquestioned.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

It is laid in Hawaii during the revolutionary days of the early nineties. The main and subsidiary themes, as stated by Tully, are "the disappearance of the so-called inferior races before the advancement of the Anglo-Saxon race," a study of the degeneracy and death which the higher race pays through any amalgamation with the lower, a plea for home missionary work as opposed to foreign, and "a dramatization of the well-known fact that though we dress, educate and polish the members of a lower race to the superficial religious and social equality with the Caucasians, at heart he is still the fetich-worshipping savage who will become atavistic in every moment of stress." This load of purpose would seem too heavy for a play to carry, but Tully has made it concrete by centering attention upon Luana, the Hawaiian girl who loves Paul Wilson, an American who has intended to go on to the leper settlement at Molokai and investigate the possibilities of cure, but who is kept on the island by his infatuation for Luana. Her character is remarkably well drawn. She is not merely a physically attractive savage; she is of the old royal stock of Hawaii, and the mingling of her primitive racial impulses, of her longing for union with a man of a higher race and of her passion of love, produces a character with which we are ready to sympathize. This sympathy is made keener by her final sacrifice to free her husband from the chains that are dragging him down, and her plunge into the mouth of the volcano which, according to the religion of her people, demands a human sacrifice, gives a touch of magnificence to the climax of the drama. Tully was as prodigal in his characters as in his scenery and as a contrast to Luana and Wilson he provided a vivid sketch of Dean, the American beach comber, who under the influence of Diana Larned redeems himself and seizes the opportunity Wilson has relinquished. The determination of Dean, drunken as he is, not to lose his white birthright through a native taint, is a good dramatic motive.

The influence of *Madame Butterfly* upon *The Bird of Paradise* is obvious, and the latter in its turn is important as

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

one of the earliest plays to treat the life in the Pacific islands sympathetically, by a writer who had first-hand knowledge. The dances, the mystic ceremonies of the older cults are well managed as aids of romance, and the contrast of the incoming civilization of the United States is drawn sharply, in such characters as Captain Hatch, the sugar planter. *Omar the Tent-Maker* (1914), while sufficiently true to the traditional Persia of the time of Omar Khayyám, has not the interest of the plays which were based on Tully's actual experience. His imagination, powerful at times, needs the restraint of his own knowledge and *Omar*, with its love scenes, escapes, assassinations, trials and rescues, gives us no characters which remain with the vividness of those in *The Bird of Paradise*. In *The Flame* (1916) Tully laid the scene in Yucatan, and attempted another contrast of American civilization, this time with that of Mexico. The modern American types of consuls and oil and fruit prospectors are just as conventional as the Mexican generals and rebels, but Maya, the young guardian of the Treasure, who interposes as a protector over the fortunes of the Americans, gives occasion for scenes in which the beauty of the old Ritual of the Flame is contrasted with the terror of the Green Jungle where reigns Shantee, the priestess of the debasing rites of the Goat without Horns, of which the sacrifice of a white child is the center. Tully claims he is correct in his representation of these rites, and he certainly uses them effectively in the play. His employment of the tom-tom to intensify the feeling of terror in the whites of the approaching danger from the revolution, points forward to later plays. But on the stage the result was confusing and the introduction of too many themes and characters kept the audience bewildered.

One of the most original notes in romance was struck by a playwright who had begun in an earlier manner. George Cochrane Hazelton, Jr., after training on the stage with Booth and Barrett in 1890, wrote for Henrietta Crossman *Mistress Nell* (1900), one of the dramatic trifles of that period. In

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

1912, however, he collaborated with J. Harry Benrimo in *The Yellow Jacket*, in which the spirit of Chinese drama was preserved to a remarkable degree, while certain features like the Property Man were intentionally exaggerated and a chorus was introduced to make the play intelligible to American audiences. The theme of the play is a universal one. It shows first the love of a mother who kills herself that her little son may be preserved against the machinations of his father's second wife, and next the loyalty of the farmer and his wife, who bring up their young charge concealed from his enemies until the time comes to take his rightful place. Then it takes Wu Hoo Git, the hero, through many dangers, animated by his love for Plum Blossom and guided by the spirit of his mother, till he conquers his rival and half-brother and ascends his throne. The interest of the play on the stage lay in the clever use of the Chinese dramatic conventions for the creation of comedy. The nonchalant way in which the property man picked up a sword and presented it to Wu Hoo Git and then returned to his side of the stage and smoked until he was needed to bring a throne or a ladder for the spirit of Chee Moo, the mother, to ascend visibly to Heaven, kept the audience in good spirits, and the chorus, who explained everything carefully, preserved the delightful artificiality of the illusion. This artificiality permitted the quick passage from comedy to pathos and also allowed a *naïveté*, which was certainly not Chinese, to present the effect of a fairy tale. The printed play reveals a certain poetic conception and a satire which is probably the work of Hazelton, while to Benrimo the stage details were mainly due. Benrimo had been familiar with imitations of Chinese drama, for he acted in *The First Born* in 1897. *The Yellow Jacket* was a success, artistically and financially, but it probably affected our drama very little. It was a thing to be done once, but an imitation would have been impossible, for the very stage conventions were in a sense part of the individual play. When Benrimo and Harrison Rhodes collaborated in *The Willow Tree* (1917) they made no attempt to imitate *The Yellow*

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Jacket, but wrought in a more usual fashion a fantasy of Japanese romance, based on the old story of a wooden image coming to life and the consequent love affair between herself and a young Englishman who has purchased her. The note of fantasy was unfortunately precipitated in the last act by the departure of the Englishman to the war.

Edward Knoblock, the author of *Kismet*, presents in his career an interesting result of theatrical conditions in the United States. He was born in New York City in 1874 and while an undergraduate at Harvard took an active part in college theatricals in both English and French. Determined to become a playwright, he was certain that the best way to obtain a hearing in his own country was to win a place first abroad,—so he has lived for the most part in London or on the Continent. The history of his plays has perhaps justified him, for several, if not all, of them have had their first performance abroad. He has lived to see conditions change, but the nature of his dramatic work has been permanently affected by his foreign residence and by his modeling of his work upon the Elizabethan dramatists. He has chosen themes that are universal or perhaps better, cosmopolitan, in their scope and he has constructed his plays so often in a series of scenes that he has become almost identified with that form. His early plays were largely the dramatization of fiction. One of these, *The Cottage in the Air* (1909), was the second of the offerings of the New Theatre, an adaptation of the novel, *The Princess Priscilla's Fortnight*, by the author of *Elizabeth and Her German Garden*. It was a trifle, delicate in treatment, concerning one of those princely episodes in disguise which were so popular at that time. But no matter what the material or the form of his plays may be, the original impulse is romantic. Knoblock sometimes attracts attention by his central idea. In *The Faun* (1911), for example, he introduced one of those mythical persons into the house of a gentleman in England, with satiric intent. In *Kismet*, which ran for many months in London before it began its great popular success in New York

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

in December, 1911, Knoblock attempted to place the atmosphere of the Arabian nights on the modern stage. He was fortunate that in America Otis Skinner played the part of Hajj, the beggar, who conspires to kill the Caliph, finds in his prison cell his chief enemy whom he kills, drowns the Wasir, who would have possessed his daughter, and finally after the Caliph has taken his daughter as a wife, returns to his post on the steps of the mosque, asking for alms. It took all the charm of Skinner's personality to make the part convincing and the general effect was that of the play in which character has been so subordinated to situation that it soon fades from the memory. In fact the usual impression that we receive from Knoblock's plays is that he is so much interested in the theatrical effect of his situations that he really cares little about the development of character. There is somewhat more characterization in *Milestones* (1912), in which he collaborated with Arnold Bennett. The theatrical framework is probably Knoblock's. The central idea of representing the three generations of a British family, in 1860, in 1885 and in 1912, with the progressives of one period becoming conservatives of the next, is sufficiently obvious and affords opportunities for clever epigrams in which the hand of Bennett is clear. The manner in which love triumphs or fails was treated with sufficient universality to make the play successful in its day. But the difficulty with such satire lies in the danger that before the ink is dry the new generation will find its radicalism fading. The most elaborate attempt of Knoblock at the period play was *My Lady's Dress* (1914). In three acts, each of three scenes, he traces the manufacture, the trimming, and the making of the dress of an English gentlewoman, taking the characters into Italy, Holland and Russia and as far back as 1660. Through all the changes the physical resemblance to Anne, the modern heroine of the first scene, is preserved. The result is epic rather than dramatic, and each heroine who makes her sacrifice to contribute to the perfect result which Anne is to wear is with us too little to secure our interest. Knoblock failed to

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

fuse the varying strands together by presenting Anne in the dress itself in some striking scene. There is a technical difficulty, too, about such a play. It must be hard for a leading actress to adapt herself to so many changes of personnel. To be sure the cast repeats in varying combinations, but still the reactions are dissimilar and that cumulative effect which a closely knit play provides is lacking, not only in the drama itself but in its process of interpretation.

Perhaps a sense of this led Knoblock, in *Marie Odile* (1915), toward a more unified form. But even the beauty of the Belasco production could not make the play believable. It is laid in 1870 when the Germans were invading Alsace, and Sister Marie Odile, a novice, left behind by the other nuns, believes Corporal Phillip Meissner is Saint Michael and when her baby is born is convinced it is the result of a miracle. The play, however, does not convince the audience of her belief because there is no establishment of the atmosphere in which, alone, miracles become credible on the stage. The mixture of supposedly realistic conversation on the part of the soldiers and later of the nuns, with the supernatural innocence of Sister Marie Odile left me cold, notwithstanding the acting of Frances Starr.

This lack of a convincing quality is apparent too in *Tiger! Tiger!* (1918) and *The Lullaby* (1923). The love story of an English gentleman and a crook simply does not persuade us of its reality and *The Lullaby*, while it portrays with some verisimilitude, the descent of a French peasant girl from respectability in 1860, to a den of infamy in Tunis in 1903, wearies one finally with the narrative of her misery. Knoblock is interesting mainly in his experiments in form. While he did not invent the period play or even treat for the first time the material of the East, he became one of the principal exponents of the exotic romance, and there can be little doubt of his influence upon other writers, like Zoë Akins, in such a play as *The Varying Shore*. But he is even more useful as an example

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

of the difference between great and second-rate romance. John Luther Long before him, Sheldon in his own period and, of course, O'Neill after him, have shown the possibilities of the play in scenes separated by time, whether freed from the technical division into acts or not. But in each case an imaginative conception of great passion was fusing the scenes into unity. Knoblock with his keen sense for the theatre, and his love of beauty, has fancy but little imagination, and his characters are but thumbnail sketches, which the situations overshadow.

The play of a period without any definite historical background is found also in the work of Laurence Eyre, an actor who began his stage career in a revival of Boucicault's *The Jilt* in 1907 and who has represented in his plays the romance of sentiment with some real sense of the dramatic value of racial contrasts. *The Things That Count* (1913), a Christmas play, had a long run, and in 1915 he produced *Sazus Matazus*, an amusing comedy, with some characterization, and an accurate picture of the happy inconsequence of the negro. While statements concerning priority are always dangerous, it seems to be the first full-length play dealing entirely with negro characters to be produced professionally on the American stage. *Miss Nelly of N'Orleans* (1919), in which Mrs. Fiske played the part of a woman no longer young but not too old for romance, had some local color and a sense of the past striking into the present, with a broken love story to be renewed. In *The Merry Wives of Gotham* (1924) Eyre contrasted two sisters who had been separated as infants and had grown up, one in luxury and one in Shantytown in New York. The idea was not bad and Grace George and Laura Hope Crews gave splendid performances as the two sisters. But the audiences did not recognize Shantytown and the reality with which Harrigan had portrayed that region and its people was not present. The seventies had a somewhat better presentation in Arthur Richman's *Not So Long Ago* (1920), laid in New York City. Elsie Dover, a seamstress, who is engaged by the day to sew for Mrs. Ballard, builds up a purely imaginary love affair with the son

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

of the house, who is unaware of her existence. The father demands an explanation and Billy Ballard visits the house with the natural result. It was not, however, the slender plot that attracted the audiences but the clever dialogue and the lightness of the touch of the playwright who was to do such a different kind of work in *Ambush*.

During the early years of the century there came a natural reaction against the deluge of plays which were made hastily from the historical novels, frequently of dubious merit, whose crest came about 1900. The impulse to place historical characters on the stage never ceased, however, but when Long and Belasco wrote *Adrea* in 1905, Long invented a country and an atmosphere. There was a real sense of history in MacKaye's *Jeanne d'Arc* and *Sappho and Phaon*, and Mary Johnston in *The Goddess of Reason* (1908) furnished Julia Marlowe a play based on the French Revolution in which there is reflected the spirit of that epoch. This blank-verse play has some dramatic moments, especially in the last Act, but it secured a personal success for the actress rather than the playwright.

An individual quality, however, is to be found in the dramatization of historical characters in the work of Philip Moeller (1880-), a Columbia man, whose education has also consisted of extensive foreign travel. He was one of the pioneers of the Washington Square Players and is now one of the directors of the Theatre Guild. His first efforts were in the one-act play, of which the best are *Helen's Husband* (1915), an amusing travesty on the situation in the household of Menelaus and Helen, and *Two Blind Beggars and One Less Blind* (1915) a grim satire, laid in a ragpicker's cellar. These were produced during the formative period of the Washington Square Players. But in his first important play, *Madame Sand* (1917), he proved himself a master of the sophisticated romance of history. Moeller thoroughly grasps his period not only in its scenic accessories but also in the artistic essentials. For example, in *Madame Sand* he carefully chooses the compositions of Chopin, which are to be played as gradual introduc-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

tions to the love episode of the Polish composer and the heroine. The audience is to be placed in just the right mood and the *motif* is as clearly indicated as in grand opera. But the art conceals the art. Nothing is allowed to contest the supremacy of the central character. George Sand is present at all times, either concretely on the stage or by suggestion in the conversation of the other characters. Yet we never feel as we do in the obvious devices of many playwrights that we are being prepared for her entrance or exit. For she really is the center of all interest and it therefore becomes quite natural that the other creations of the dramatists should be thinking of her. Whether it be her three lovers, Alfred de Musset, Pagello the Italian doctor, and Frederick Chopin, or her enemies, like Madame de Musset, or Lucrezia Violente, who are endeavoring to save their sons or lovers from her, they are at all times vitally in contact with her or with her image. Even more skillfully portrayed, because less obviously necessary, are the men like Heinrich Heine, Franz Liszt, and Buloz, her editor and publisher, who know all her love affairs, see through her schemes, and yet remain her devoted friends. Their recognition of her genius, which places her in a class to them beyond ordinary law, their masculine attitude of toleration which forbids them to try to order her life, both flavored with a touch of gallantry though not of passion, feed delicately the demand of George Sand, the woman, for that sympathy which Moeller so deftly transfers through the minor characters to the audience. The historic characters make another contribution not so apparent. One of the most distressing qualities in smart comedy is the apparent planting of the epigram. But the epigrams, and they are many, come naturally from the lips of Heine, De Musset and Liszt. When Heine remarks: "Our enemies are the price we pay for fame"—and when Liszt says of the Italian doctor: "Why, all you had to do was to look at his perfect profile to realize his limitations," the playwright has defended himself in advance against the charge of artificiality. Even the choice of George Sand shows Moeller's

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

sense of values. Her history is not well enough known to the average audience to make them critical, so he can take liberties with her career provided he creates a dramatic character. This he has done supremely well and he has made of her very inconstancy a consistent and unifying force. The three Acts deal with three love affairs, and in the hands of a lesser artist might have become merely episodic. But partly through the preservation of her personal background in the friends like Heine and Buloz, but more fundamentally through the co-ordinating motive of her remorseless demand as an artist that life should provide the novelist with experiences, the episodes fuse into a unity complete and satisfying.

Quite as effective was *Molière* (1919), in which Moeller took some liberties with history, but usually with success. There was a charming picture of the French playwright's method of work and of the devotion of his cook, who is his constant critic. The passion of the Marquise de Montespan, the mistress of Louis XIV, for Molière, leads her to plan a meeting between Armande, his young wife, and her lover De Luzon in Montespan's garden and she hopes by revealing to Molière the perfidy of his wife to bring him to her own arms. Then when he rejects her, and Louis enters unexpectedly there is a masterly scene in which the arrogance and suspicion of the King are met by the defiance of the playwright who gives up the favor of the court to return to the freer atmosphere in which his art can find its best expression. Through this scene, laid in France in the Seventeenth Century, rings the spirit of the independent theatre of America of the Twentieth, the universal challenge of the artist. The death of Molière, at the close of the performance of his *Le Malade imaginaire*, is a model for such scenes. Moeller has brought together the threads of the dramatic interest, the love of his work, the love of Armande, who returns to him, and even the favor of the King, who comes too late, into a situation whose restraint is telling. The tragedy meets the requirements—there is no de-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

pression, for we have assisted at the passing of a gallant soul who has been true to his own standards.

Sophie (1919) has not quite the distinction of *Madame Sand* or of *Molière*. The central character is not so significant, in the first place. But more important is the shift in the relative values of Moeller's impulses. In the two other plays, sophistication flavored the romance, which caught and held us. In *Sophie*, the romance has become merely the flavor of the sophistication, and the temptation to be brilliantly cynical captured him to the detriment of the drama. Yet *Sophie* is, even with this limitation, far above the usual play of its species. The temperamental nature of Sophie Arnold, the opera singer of the time of Louis XV, is extremely well drawn. The central situation, in which she assumes the position of mistress, in name only, to the Austrian Ambassador in Paris, accepting his support and giving him in return the social *éclat* attaching to the man who can win such an association with the greatest stage favorite of her time, is ripe for comedy. But it is so essentially heartless that the love story between herself and DeLauraguais cannot stir our sympathies. Moeller probably felt this, for he introduces another love story over which Sophie presides and for which she apparently sacrifices the Ambassador. The device of making the runaway daughter of the Chief of Police, a man who is her own worst enemy, the heroine of this other romance, which checkmates him and leaves Sophie in undisputed possession of DeLauraguais at midnight in the Ambassador's own house, is also clever. But cleverness alone, even when clothed in brilliant dialogue, is not enough. We do not really care for any of the characters. They are too cynical, too heartless, too sophisticated, for us to believe in them. They do not pronounce their epigrams, either, with the authority of the historical characters of the earlier plays, for they are all figments of the fancy. Yet the play makes delightful reading.

One of the most ambitious attempts at the historical play was the work of David Carb and Walter Prichard Eaton

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

(1878-). *Queen Victoria* (1923) was set in seven scenes, from her accession to the throne in 1837 to the sixtieth anniversary of that event in 1897. The production was sumptuous and the cast a fine one, but the audiences remained cold. The reasons for the comparative failure are significant as showing the limitations of this kind of play. In the first place, *Queen Victoria* was an epic, not a dramatic character. The scenes were unduly separated and it was impossible to find one actress who could impersonate the girl in 1837 and the old lady in 1897. Prince Albert, of whom much was made, is an almost forgotten figure to Americans. But the lack of any fusing emotion to bind the scenes together was the most apparent defect of the drama. Yet notwithstanding its limitations it remains to the historian, who happened to see it and John Drinkwater's *Robert E. Lee* on successive evenings, a much more effective drama than the latter. The American playwrights had taken the trouble to study the period of English history; the British playwright had not learned the language of American institutions.

A playwright who is representative of the sophisticated romance, without roots in history like Moeller, but concerned like him with the departure from real life into a world where romance is secured by a fanciful and satirical treatment of social relations, Zoë Akins (1886-) is an uncertain quality in the drama. She had some training in the Odeon Stock Company in St. Louis, and has written verse and fiction in addition to her plays, some of which remain unproduced and date from the early years of the Twentieth Century. She had been one of the pioneers in the establishment of the Juvenile Theatre in St. Louis about 1908, and here her *Magical City* was first performed; but her first real opportunity came when the *Magical City* was produced by the Washington Square Players in 1916. It is a one-act play in free verse, with the theme of the effect of the great city, New York, upon a girl, her "protector" and her young poet lover, who kills him. There are some fine lines, but the play is tainted by an artificial profundity, which has

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

remained characteristic of Miss Akins. *Papa* (1916) is an example of the romance of sophistication. It is satire upon the heartlessness of charming people, though the charm lies mostly in the author's imagination. There is really no play, although there are occasional moments which permit clever acting, such as the group picture in which Doris, who has taken the responsibility for Chloe's child, hears the little girl's prayers in a sweetly devotional attitude while she holds a cigarette in her free hand. But there is neither fidelity to any life nor power in the imagination that lifts it above life. It is all superficial cleverness.

Miss Akins' first popular success came with the production of *Déclassée* (1919) in which Ethel Barrymore scored a personal success. While *Déclassée* is "good theatre," it is difficult to take it seriously. The decline of Lady Helen Haden from her secure position in England to a dubious one in America might be more convincing if Edith Wharton had not shown in *The House of Mirth* how a similar theme should be treated. The spectacle of a British Ambassador wasting time in a New York hotel in order that he might accidentally meet his old friend and socially rehabilitate her is almost as absurd as the death scene when Lady Helen runs out of the house and, having been hit by an automobile, takes fifteen graceful minutes to die. In *Daddy's Gone a-Hunting* (1921) Miss Akins made a brave struggle to be profound and original in her treatment of the situation in which a wife and husband find themselves mismatched and are yet held together by a child. There is some reality in the character of Julien Fields, the artist who cares little about anything but his dreams of the great work he is to do and which he will never accomplish. Fields' refusal to take back his wife, whom his indifference has driven under the protection of another man, not because of his resentment but because of his selfishness, is a relief after the usual stage reconciliation, but the conclusion, with the heroine's smiling reply to the natural query as to her future conduct, "God knows," is rather inconclusive than profound. The preceding conversa-

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

tion too, between the wife, her lover and her husband is absurd, and when the death of the little daughter is announced, we recognize that Miss Akins is endeavoring to develop the contemporary unrest of spirit by means of the older sentimental devices of the theatre. Her real sphere lies in romance, not very significant but entertaining, such as *The Varying Shore* (1921). Here after revealing her heroine at Monte Carlo in her declining years, she took her back through the stages of her progress as a professional mistress, in 1870, in 1859 and in 1846. The remarkable acting of Elsie Ferguson almost made the character credible, for while it is hard to believe in her, she is frankly a romantic conception and humanity has often liked the generous, reckless harlot who sacrifices herself at certain crucial points in her career. The interesting feature of the play, however, was its method. Stung by some criticism, the direction reversed the scenes so as to follow the chronological order, and then happily replaced them as the playwright had written them. For the order of sympathy proceeded inversely to the order of time. The audience liked Julie Venable much more as a girl of sixteen, unwilling to be forced upon a reluctant young husband, than they did as a sophisticated woman of forty, and so it was best to lead up to the earlier period as a climax. In a sense, each act was a justification of her conduct in the preceding ones, and thus a certain probability was given to something improbable and fundamentally sentimental. Miss Akins's best play, *Greatness*, produced as *A Texas Nightingale* (1922) which had more character drawing in it than usual, failed because of atrocious miscasting. The opera singer Brasa Canava with her mixture of temperament, stupidity and practical sense, is very appealing, but the central situation, which reunites her to her second husband and their son, whose birth some delicacy, totally foreign to her nature, has led her to conceal, takes one back to the romantic novel of the eighteen-forties. There was not enough body to the plot to carry the central character, who had had four husbands, all of whom had been blighted by

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

their union with her, although each one had helped her in his own way to the greatness which she had achieved. It is rather an epic theme than a dramatic one, but it has possibilities which were surely not realized in the play. Yet *Greatness* contains some of the best of Miss Akins' dialogue, and its failure was to be regretted. Still more quickly withdrawn was *A Royal Fandango*, a satirical romance laid in the Bay of Biscay. On the stage, it seemed to be a burlesque upon the romantic play of the type of Molnar's *Swan*, but it had no authority in its treatment of royalty and need not detain us. Nor need her recent adaptations from the French, like *First Love* (1926), although she did transfer to English the atmosphere of a boy and girl passion in the Latin Quarter.

The purely fanciful romance, although it has been revealed mainly in its coloring of the domestic drama or other forms, has nevertheless had some significant if sporadic examples, of which Sheldon's *The Garden of Paradise* remains supreme. In *The Poor Little Rich Girl* (1913) Eleanor Gates painted with sympathy and tenderness the longing of a little girl, whose mother and father were too busy to love her, for the simple natural life that is the right of every child. The originality of the play lay mainly in the transfer of the real characters such as her maid, her governess and teachers, the organ grinder, the policeman, and the doctor who is dining with her father and mother, into the dream which is caused by the overdose of the sleeping draught which Jane, the maid, has given her in order to be rid of her for the evening. The scenes in the Tell Tale Forest, in The Land of the Lights and around Robin Hood's Barn, mingle deftly the disordered fancies of a child's dream with the phrases, only half understood, which have made up the unreality of her life. Into this dream sound now and then through the character of the Doctor the echoes of the struggle that is being made to save Gwendolyn from the imminent danger of the drug. This note of suspicion is struck in just the right measure to keep our interest. It is difficult without extensive quotation to do justice to the tact with which

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Miss Gates kept her symbolism under control. It is a pity that the author of *The Poor Little Rich Girl* did not continue in the same vein. While her next play, *We Are Seven* (1913), had some element of fancy, especially in the hopes of the heroine concerning her possible children, whom she is going to bring up in the proper way, it has not the appeal of her first effort. *Swat the Fly* is pure propaganda and is negligible.

One of the most original of the purely imaginative romances, which deserved a better fate, was *A Young Man's Fancy* (1919), by John T. McIntyre (1871-). The play is in prose but the conception is poetic. In fact the hero, Pickering, himself is a poet, and lives in the visions his imagination paints for him. While passing a shop window, he sees the figure of a girl who is used as a window dresser in a garden party scene and he falls in love with his ideal of her. The image has been made by a real artist and has been modeled after a girl, Mary Darling, in the employ of the establishment. We are taken from the street into the shop and then into the realm of Pickering's fancy, and he moves among his creations, who live, of course, only as long as his vision lasts. The love scenes between Pickering and Mary's image are among the best which our modern stage has given us, and the sense of impending fate which will separate him from the love and beauty of his own creation is heartrending in its restraint. The transfer from the dream to reality, in which the real Mary comes to Pickering, was done adequately, but was difficult to manage, especially under the conditions in which the drama was produced. The scenery, painted by Joseph Urban, practically killed the play, so strongly did it call attention to itself. It is a grim commentary upon the taste of the public that the actress who portrayed Mary for two weeks played for several years the leading part in such a drama as *Rain*.

It is not within the scope of this account to treat of the opera, but the work of Brian Hooker (1880-) rises above the standard of the libretto to that of dramatic poetry of real significance. *Mona* was awarded in 1911 the prize of ten thou-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

sand dollars, offered by the Metropolitan Opera Company, for the best American opera—the music being composed by Horatio Parker. It was produced at the Metropolitan Opera House, March 14, 1912, and four performances were given during the season 1911-12. Hooker, though he laid *Mona* in the first century in Britain, made no effort at historical accuracy. His theme is the conflict of love and patriotism in a woman's heart and the tragedy that ensues when she yields to the dream of conquest and empire and forgets her love. Gwynn, the son of the Roman governor, would have reconciled the Britons to their conquerors through his marriage with the legitimate princess of Britain—just how is not made clear—but she listens to the arguments of her kin and banishes Gwynn from her sight. There is a strong scene in the Cromlech or Druidic open-air temple when he pleads once more for the love that shall save them both, and the final scene, when after the defeat of the Britons, she kills Gwynn for what she believes to be his treachery, is also powerful. The inconsistencies inseparable from opera need not be emphasized and the lyrics with their structure based on Old English and not on Celtic rhythms may be excused, perhaps, on the ground that no audience would care about the matter. What makes *Mona* important is the sheer beauty of the conception of character and the distinction of the verse. *Mona's* speech at the last love scene in the Cromlech shows how Hooker had shaken off the Victorian tradition which persisted in writing narrative verse in drama:

Mona: There is a cloud over the moon—
I cannot see thy face . . . Only thine arms
Around me like strong sleep . . . Only thy voice—
And all our children laughing in thine eyes . . . !
And it is good for me to put away
Weariness, and the fever of high deeds,
And the dry hunger . . . Now earth sinks and swims
Falling, and the great river of joy flows down,—
Inevitable, tender, luminous,—
And whelms me, and I float under the moon
Quietly, toward the foam-bright sea . . . Down, down,

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Where the glimmering shores grow faint, and darkness
Buries the sky, and the stars drown, and the deep
Rises over me, and I dream . . .

The farewell of Mona to Gwynn over his dead body while his father and the Roman soldiers stand ready to seize her, is so far above the usual libretto of grand opera as to be of a different category. A few lines will show its quality:

Mona:

I might have died

Yonder, and not known.

—See, how Earth holds up

Her freshness to the summer, and the light

Laughs over living green, and the birds are glad,

And the sweet blossoms brighten in the sun,

And all the bitter beauty of the day

Makes merry with my sorrow—And I go

To walk alive among dead hours, and see

Pitiless faces and the mirth of men

Whose eyes are evil, and be fawned upon

By strange hands . . . for I cannot even keep

My faith to him that died because of me,

Nor in a clean death lay my body down

Beside his body . . . I must bear my time,

Having done no good thing, remembering all—

And there will be so many other days,

So many other days . . .

Give me the sword—

It is mine . . .

Dost thou think I can still fear?

I loved him . . . and I killed him . . .

Bear with me

A little.

Fairyland, which won a prize in the American Opera Association competition in 1915, is laid in the Thirteenth Century in Central Europe, but as before, historical accuracy is not preserved. What is given is the romance of youth, the search for adventure, the love that passes into *Fairyland* and returns to real life at will. It is written in the same varied and flexible

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

verse, and the lyrics are charming. Hooker proved again by his translation of *Cyrano de Bergerac* for Walter Hampden that he was a poet with a real sense of the stage, for a share of the great artistic success of that production belongs to him. His *White Bird* (1924), an attempt to place an operatic situation in the early Nineteenth Century in a rural district in central New York State, is dramatically not very effective.

The recent artistic success of the opera of *The King's Henchman* first produced at the Metropolitan Opera House, February 17, 1927, has recalled attention to the early work of Edna St. Vincent Millay, *Aria da Capo* (1919) and *The Lamp and the Bell* (1921), especially the latter, with its story of the deep affection of two girls for each other which survives even through disappointed love. Written for an anniversary of Vassar College, it translates into terms of medieval life the strong friendships made during undergraduate days, and is one more of the many links which have bound our drama from its beginning to the colleges.

But *The King's Henchman* far surpasses these plays in power. Viewed simply as a dramatic poem, even without the aid of the music of Deems Taylor, which helped to make it the artistic sensation of the season, it challenges admiration for the stark directness and simplicity with which it establishes character and atmosphere. It is laid in the Tenth Century, in the reign of King Eadgar, to whom history's significant silence pays a tribute. The story of Eadgar's sending of his foster brother Æthelwold, to woo for him Ælfrida, the daughter of the Thane of Devon, of the love that springs up between them, of Æthelwold's lying message to the King concerning her appearance, of the King's visit and the consequent tragedy are legendary romance. The power of *The King's Henchman* rises almost like a sea throughout the drama. The characters of the two men are drawn in the first Act, and the courtly savagery of the Saxon King's hall at Winchester is established by conversation in which Miss Millay has employed skilfully a vocabulary which is derived from English sources with almost

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

too scrupulous an avoidance of words of Latin origin. After beginning with the Harper's chant in the Old English measures, she wisely avoids following them in her dramatic verse, though being a poet she cannot escape their influence, especially in the lyrics. These are magnificent, but while fine lyrics were to be expected from the author of *Renascence* the dramatic climaxes of the second and third Acts were not to be foreshadowed by anything she had done. The love scene when Æthelwold and Ælfrida meet in the forest on All Hallow's Eve pulses with the passion that rarely finds its way to the modern stage—one speech can hardly illustrate it:

Æthelwold: Oh, Godes Son!

How wounding fair thou art!
The sight of thee
Is like a knife at the heart,
Of thee the sight or the sound,
The turn of thy head, thy speaking,
Is like a thing found,
To a man seeking.

But the play builds higher. When the two lovers have settled into the aftermath of passion, the King suddenly comes to Devon. Then Æthelwold tells Ælfrida of his deception and begs her for the sake of their love to keep her bower. But she appears in the splendor of her beauty to greet the King and Eadgar cries out in wonder at her charm and in grief at his betrayal by the man he loves best.

Whose hand shall I take?
Yea, for if thy tongue be forked, Æthelwold,
Then from sea to sea my kingdom hisses!

Here Miss Millay leaves the original legend. According to William of Malmesbury,¹ on whose account all modern versions seem to depend, Æthelwold was killed by Eadgar. But for dramatic purposes, Miss Millay wisely has Æthelwold com-

¹ Book II, Chap. 8.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

mit suicide. This transfers the sympathy to him and there is a splendid touch when Maccus, his friend, bids Ælfrida draw back from the body—

So.

I would not have thee foul this blood

and Eadgar bids her stay her weeping:

Eadgar: Have done, Ælfrida.

Thou hast not tears enow in thy narrow heart
To weep him worthily.
Wherefore have done.

Nor all of us here,
Nor all of England weeping,
Should weep his worth,
That was so young and blithe and bold,
Whom the thorn of a rose hath slain.

Wherefore let us hoard our tears for a little sorrow,
And weep not for Æthelwold at all.

Like *Mona*, *The King's Henchman* is a triumph of American art, dramatic and musical, universal in theme, free in treatment and distinguished in form.

The romance has taken on a verse form only sporadically and its form is less a matter of importance than its spirit. In 1920 the Poetry Society of America prepared a selected list of sixty-four dramas in verse which had been published since 1900.¹ Of these, which included the work of Moody, MacKaye and others already treated, more than half had been produced, though largely in the Little Theatres or by groups like the Provincetown Players.

Mrs. Jane Dransfield, who selected this list from over two hundred and fifty titles, has written one of the most widely performed verse dramas in *The Lost Pleiad* (1918), a dream fantasy laid in Greece. It was first produced at the Brooklyn Academy of Music and its frequent reproduction by Little Theatre groups is indicative of the need for drama of its kind.

¹ *The Library Journal*, XLV (1920), pp. 395-6.

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

At her instigation, a prize was offered by William Lindsey, through the Poetry Society of America, for the best play in verse. It was won in 1921 by Harry Lee with *Il Poverello*, later called *The Little Poor Man*, which was produced in 1925 and ran for several weeks. The central character is St. Francis of Assisi, in his progress from a youth of adventure through the serene dignity of humility and sacrifice, to his death. The human quality of St. Francis is stressed and the result is an attractive dramatic picture. The verse is rhythmical, but free in the number of stresses in each line; in fact like Royle's *Launcelot and Elaine* it is expressed in verse phrases rather than lines.

One of the hopeful indications of the vitality of the verse play and the growing popular appreciation of good things in the theatre was the success of *Caponsacchi*, the dramatization of Browning's *The Ring and the Book*, which ran practically all through the season of 1926-7. Originally suggested to Walter Hampden by Miss Rose A. Palmer as a fit subject for a play, it was put into dramatic form by his brother-in-law, Arthur Goodrich (1878-), who had been known as the author of such light theatrical fare as *So This Is London*. It was first produced in Indianapolis in 1923 as *The Ring of Truth*, and underwent considerable change before its performance in New York. Goodrich's task was no easy one. Browning's genius was dramatic and those who had the good fortune to see his *In a Balcony* performed by Otis Skinner, Mrs. Le Moyne and Miss Robson will not agree with the usual statement that all his plays are unsuited to the theatre. But he had not chosen to dramatize the theme of *The Ring and the Book*, which might have given Mr. Goodrich pause. The latter conceived, however, of the proper solution, to center the interest upon the priest, Caponsacchi, who has tried to save Pompilia, the wife of Count Guido Franceschini, from her devilish husband. The drama opens with the trial of Guido for the murder of his wife and her parents, and when Caponsacchi is asked to make his statement the ensuing scenes are

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

a review or "flashback" of the events leading up to the murder. Then the play reverts to the courtroom until the Pope, who has been hidden behind the curtain, pronounces judgment upon Guido and blesses Caponsacchi. Walter Hampden's interpretation of the warrior-priest who conquered himself and dared public scandal to save a woman made desperate by cruelty and injustice, was memorable, and by a happy accident, Pompilia was played by Edith Barrett, the granddaughter of Laurence Barrett, the great exponent of the heroic drama. Goodrich provided Hampden with a heroic part, whose success disproved the distrust of the rhythmic drama. The reason the heroic drama is not often played is simply that there are few actors who are trained to interpret it. The real artistry of the dramatization can be appreciated, however, only when it is compared with Browning's poem. Mr. Goodrich, who had been a close student of Browning since his college career at Wesleyan, skillfully built up on a scaffold of Browning's verse a play which, so far as language is concerned, is largely his own. As was well said by Clayton Hamilton in his "afterword" to the published play, it is easy to parody Browning but to imitate him without parody "is a task that calls for special and peculiar delicacy."

While the romantic interest to be derived from the exotic or the historic or the fanciful has naturally been most frequently invoked by the playwright, there has been during this period a sincere attempt to treat the romance that can be developed out of familiar life. Perhaps the most consistent exponent of this species has been Edward Childs Carpenter (1892-), who began his dramatic work while financial editor of the Philadelphia *Inquirer*. It is true that he has departed from familiar life occasionally as in *The Barber of New Orleans* (1908), in which he lays the scene in New Orleans about 1804. In this romantic comedy he made use of the theme of mixed blood and shows the influence of *The Octoroon* and *The White Slave*. It won a prize offered by the New York *Globe* in 1908 and when produced with William Faver-

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

sham as the Barber, Victor Jallot, made a charming impression. In *The Challenge* (1911) Carpenter sought the romance of the West and built up vigorous melodramatic comedy around the character of Alberta Bradley, the young owner of the Green Basin Ranch in Arizona. While Alberta is a stock figure, there are nevertheless some strong scenes, especially the one in which she attacks Douglas Quarrier, chief engineer of the Green Basin Land and Irrigation Company, and shows her real affection for him after he has conquered her. *The Tongues of Men* (1913) is a study of the contrast between the artistic and the clerical standards of life, with a rather obvious lesson of charity. But Carpenter has depicted a very real opera singer in Jane Bartlett.

Carpenter's most successful play, however, was *The Cinderella Man* (1916). Here he has taken the old fairy story and reversed the sexes. Anthony Quintard, a young poet and playwright who lives in a garret, is visited by Marjorie Caner, the daughter of a millionaire, who lives in the next house and who watches over him in a motherly fashion until the inevitable love story develops. It is easy to dismiss such a play as *The Cinderella Man* on the ground of its improbability. Audiences in this country, in England, and in other parts of the world were delighted by the play, and the secret of its success lies in the tender, wistful note which Carpenter succeeded in giving to the love story. There is no moment in the play when the audience does not earnestly desire that Marjorie Caner shall succeed, not only in winning Tony's love, but in revealing to him the depth of her own affection for him.

In *The Pipes of Pan* (1917) probably his best play, he has developed a very appealing theme, the incarnation of an ideal love of a man's youth, cherished through years, and crowned with the halo of illusion. Carpenter wisely chose a painter for his hero and frankly threw away actuality by the escapade which brings the revived Valentine after an all night's adventure to breakfast at the painter's studio. Wisely also he made the adventure an episode and so preserved the illusion for the

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

rest of Redford's life. *The Pipes of Pan* gives Carpenter a right to serious consideration for the restraint with which he handled a situation that might have broken into erotic fragments, and for the delicacy with which he has touched the relations of the central characters.

In *Pot-Luck* (1921), Carpenter tried to draw out of small-town life a romance based upon Amy Jewell's marriage with a man whom she has met through a marriage bureau. There is some good characterization, but the play has not the interest of *The Cinderella Man* or of *The Pipes of Pan*. Nor has *Bab* (1920), founded upon a novel by Mary Roberts Rinehart, or *Connie Goes Home* (1923), founded on a story by Fannie Kilbourne, the interest of the original plays. *Bab* provided Helen Hayes with an appropriate part but the impression was chiefly that of stage dexterity.

The romance that is a revolt from the routine of familiar life, although it is based upon it, was the inspiration of *The Gypsy Trail* (1917) by Robert Housum (1886-), a Yale graduate and a newspaper man. He succeeded in translating into terms of modern life the longing for adventure which in the older drama was represented by the gypsy convention. What lifted *The Gypsy Trail* above the usual play upon this theme was the contrast of the two central characters, Frances Raymond and Michael Rudder. Frances is about to be engaged to Edward Andrews, who represents all that is solid and substantial. She welcomes Michael who appears in the guise of a newspaper man, as a way out into a freer life than she has known. But Michael, although he is very much attracted to her, sees in marriage a prison from which he revolts and he runs away in a borrowed car almost as soon as they have discovered they love each other. It seems a pity that Housum could not have closed his play on this note, but he brought Michael back a millionaire with a heavy load of respectability to recommend him, and turned the play into farce at the end. His other plays indeed are farce comedies, but there is a touch of fancy in *The Gypsy Trail*, and the scene in which Michael

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

describes the wandering life he has led has a bit of poetry in it that is sincere.

The ethical romance has had as its principal exponent Charles Rann Kennedy (1871-), an Englishman who has become sufficiently identified with his adopted country to be considered here. His first work to attract serious attention, *The Servant in the House* (1908), was a study in human brotherhood. It was laid in England but the message was universal. The Bishop of Benares, India, comes into the house of his brother, the Vicar, disguised as a butler, Manson. Their other brother, who is a cleaner of drains, provides one aspect of the contrast, and their brother-in-law, the Bishop of Lancashire, the other. Manson is a Christlike figure and as played by Walter Hampden, made a profound impression. The significance of *The Servant in the House* as drama lay in the skilful way in which Kennedy kept his symbolism and ethical message in control. The language is natural and the searching criticism of hypocrisy and pretence is carried on in a convincing way, without the concreteness of the characters being lost. *The Winter Feast* (1908) also has a certain power, if somewhat unrestrained. This romance of the Eleventh Century in Iceland is hardly historical; it is a study of the evil effect of hate which, sprung from earlier love and friendship, brings death and destruction to the family of Thorkel. There are powerful scenes, such as that in which Swanhild, the little grand-daughter of Thorkel, tells her mother of the new love which has come to her, while her lover lies dead in the next room, having killed himself because he saw no alternative between the slaying of his own father and the breaking of his promise to Herdisa, Swanhild's mother, that he would avenge her upon her enemy. But the types are not so well controlled as in *The Servant in the House*. Kennedy's later writing has become steadily less dramatic and more ethical, until it passes out of our scrutiny. He has also been concerned with experiments in new forms, such as *The Terrible Meek* (1912), a daring attempt to interpret the Crucifixion in terms of mod-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

ern pacificism. The stage is perfectly dark and voices are heard speaking in modern tones, those of a woman, whose son has been killed and of a captain and a soldier, who have executed him. At the end of their conversation the light comes on and they are seen to be in the costumes of the time of Christ, while the three gaunt crosses become visible. The difficulty with Kennedy's work is that he does not understand the difference between a shock and a thrill. After his first two plays he seemed anxious to preach by violence and lost the sense of what is capable of dramatic interpretation. Sincere as his later plays are, and they attack evil vigorously, they irritate by their disregard of artistic effect for the purpose of propaganda.

The romance of the supernatural has had in recent years little to rival *The Return of Peter Grimm*. But in 1923 *Children of the Moon*, by Martin Flavin, showed power of conception if not complete power of execution. Flavin was born in San Francisco, where *Children of the Moon* is laid. But the interest lies not so much in the setting as in the powerful study of the family insanity of the Athertons, based on old Judge Atherton's delusion that he can see life and beauty in the moon. Our stage has seldom witnessed a more tragic climax than that of the second Act when young Jane Atherton, the judge's grand-daughter, fights for her love and her reason against the malignant influence of her mother, who believes that the race should stop. The acting of Florence Johns in this part and the remarkable performance of Henrietta Crosman as Madame Atherton, representing the constant watchfulness of common sense over the fatal weakness of the family, will not soon be forgotten by those who had the good fortune to see them. This was the first long play of Martin Flavin to be performed, though several of his one-act plays had been produced. What appealed most in *Children of the Moon* was Flavin's ability to preserve the insanity as a lurking shadow, an impending doom, not a scientific phenomenon. His *Lady of the Rose* (1925) was not so well done. It is a dream play, in which John Mere-

THE ROMANCE OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

dith, a playwright, is pictured as living in communion with his ideal. His wife finds a play of her husband's with this motive, in "Maybury's Storehouse" and she plays the part without his permission and with tragic results. There was a poetic touch in *Lady of the Rose* which made its failure one to be regretted.

This survey of the romance after 1900 cannot, of course, be complete. For the species is more often than any other, perhaps, the work of those who produce one or two plays and then cease writing or producing. To this class belongs *Enter Madame* (1920) by Gilda Varesi and Dolly Byrne, a clever picture of a prima donna, who at the prospect of a divorce from her husband, wins him back from the clutches of an attractive widow who is waiting for him. Miss Varesi is supposed to have drawn the character from that of her own mother, but inasmuch as she had herself acted in *Romance*, the influence of Sheldon's play is probable. In fact I sense the influence of Edward Sheldon through most of this period, and if his unacknowledged work could be assigned to him, that influence would be made much more apparent.

What becomes clear, however, in any historical survey, is the ever-present demand for romance. Notwithstanding the critical suspicion of the departure from actuality, the theatre is temperamentally receptive to romance. For both the theatre and romance flourish because of the human desire for relief from the long stretches of existence through the few great moments or occasions in which we really live.

CHAPTER XX

CHANGING CONDITIONS OF THE THEATRE

THE impulse which had brought encouragement and power to the American playwright about the beginning of the century never lost its strength. But as in every art, there was an ebb as well as a flow and, as is usual just before a new creative period dawns, the criticism of the contemporary is tinged with dire prophecies of failure. By the end of the first decade, the rivalry of the moving picture had become definite, and by 1915 the obituary of the road company began to be preached. It would be idle to deny that the moving picture has been on the whole not only a rival for an audience, but also a training school for auditors who will demand dramatic fare, in the legitimate theatre, of a lower intellectual quality. It is easier to use one sense than two, and when one sees only, the reaction is more purely emotional, while when one both sees and hears, the appeal is to the intellect as well. The decline in the traveling company has been brought about by a variety of causes, notably the increase in railroad rates, the rivalry of the moving picture, the practice of sending incompetent second companies with good plays, caused in its turn partly by the disinclination of certain actors to leave New York City. The growth of a more intimate form of drama, suited to the newer playhouses in New York, raises another difficulty. In many of the smaller towns, the traveling company must play in a large theatre, built in the seventies or eighties, for performances of musical comedy. The psychology of the half-filled auditorium is a real factor in deterring companies from visiting towns where a smaller theatre would adequately house those who still would support the legitimate drama. The immediate result of these

CHANGING CONDITIONS OF THE THEATRE

developments was the acceleration about 1910 of the growth of the stock companies, which indeed had been in progress at least ten years before. These met the competition of the moving picture by a cheap scale of prices, and these still continue, though their fortunes have been fluctuating. But they contributed little to the creation of drama, for they contented themselves with the reproduction of Broadway successes, although they did present often the only opportunity for playgoers to see plays that were worth while.

While the second decade is too near us to trace the dramatic tendencies with surety, there are certain evidences of that constant reaction which, through the effort to counteract evils, brings about better things. The commercial spirit in the theatre, which has always existed, has been intensified by the growing emphasis laid on New York, as the road gradually failed. There were twenty theatres in New York in 1903. In 1927 there are eighty¹ offering legitimate drama. This really excessive competition and the high rent of the buildings has accentuated a condition which has long been detrimental to the production of first-class drama. The necessity of making an immediate appeal is no new phenomenon in the theatre—we have seen how *Shore Acres* was saved only by the contract which required a four weeks' run. But now a play may be doing a fair business and still if it fails to meet a comparatively high rental, it will be withdrawn. The most insidious result lies in the temptation to playwrights to sacrifice the inevitability of tragedy or the delicate shades of comedy in order to strike the more obvious chords to which success responds. The earlier conditions under which a play could find no opportunity in New York unless a road tour had been secured, has thus given place to another form of commercial tyranny.

Many of these unfortunate conditions became apparent at the end of the first decade, and there were other reasons which brought about a temporary depression in creative writing. Fitch died in 1909, Moody in 1910, both at the height of their

¹ These figures are given on the authority of the Editors of the *Theatre Magazine*.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

creative powers. Thomas, Gillette and Belasco had done their best work by 1911, and while the average for the seasons of 1906-12, had been high, there is a decided falling off after that. To be sure, *Romance* and *The Yellow Jacket* came in 1912-13, *One Thousand Years Ago* and *Ourselves* in 1913-14, but *The Garden of Paradise* is the one play of the season of 1914-15, and *The Unchastened Woman* of the next, that are likely to be remembered, while in 1916-17 when the Pulitzer Prize was first announced, no award was made.

Yet just as this low point was reached, the forces that were to bring about regeneration were at work. If the conditions of the commercial theatre generally forbade experiment, playhouses in which opportunity for expressing original ideas in play writing, in scenic decoration, in production generally, began to be provided. It must not be forgotten that Winthrop Ames had founded the Little Theatre in 1913 and Holbrook Blinn had leased the Princess Theatre during the same year to put on plays, long and short, of the better type. But often these were of foreign make and so lie outside our province. In February, 1915, the Neighborhood Playhouse in Grand Street began its career, founded upon earlier settlement work and with a social purpose that became steadily more artistic. Under the devoted care of Helen Arthur, Agnes Morgan and Alice and Irene Lewisohn it became a potent force in providing plays of the right kind, and a background of training in many phases of theatrical work. Outside of one play each of Eugene O'Neill, Percy MacKaye, and Susan Glaspell, it confined itself, not entirely of its own volition, largely to the productions of foreign playwrights. Its main emphasis, too, was laid upon the production rather than the writing of plays. But the influence of the Neighborhood Playhouse was always upon the right side and it preserved a noncommercial attitude notwithstanding the dangers attendant upon popular success. The decision to close its doors in 1927 came as a blow to all those interested in our drama.

One week after the Neighborhood Playhouse gave its first

CHANGING CONDITIONS OF THE THEATRE

production, a group of young men and women, among whom Robert Edmond Jones, Philip Moeller, Edward Goodman, and Helen Westley were moving spirits, founded the Washington Square Players, and began to give at the Bandbox Theatre on Fifty-seventh Street, programs of one-act plays. Announcement was made that work by American authors was to be preferred and the record of the first season shows ten American to five foreign selections. This proportion became less pronounced as the Players proceeded at either the Bandbox or the Comedy Theatre. Their function in the encouragement of American playwrights was carried out in the production of the work of Philip Moeller, Alice Gerstenberg, Lewis Beach, Zoë Akins, Zona Gale, and others. The war stopped their activities in May, 1918, and when they reassembled with changes in personnel in 1919 as the Theatre Guild, the preference for foreign plays had become marked. The Theatre Guild has become less and less distinguishable from the commercial theatre. It has retained, however, to a certain degree its fondness for experiment, which has led it at times into queer places in the purlieus of dramatic art. But it is significant that its last substantial successes have been made with the plays of Sidney Howard. The plans now in operation of sending a road company of the Theatre Guild to tour not only the larger cities but also towns where a college or university may serve as a nucleus of interest, are another indication of a return to the support of the source from which our drama had its birth.

Much more important in the development of American play writing than the Neighborhood Playhouse or the Theatre Guild has been the organization known throughout various changes as the Provincetown Players. It sprang from the colony of artists at Provincetown, Massachusetts, in the summer of 1915, many of them coming from Greenwich Village, and the first plays were given on a porch. One of these, *Suppressed Desires*, by Susan Glaspell, has become a stand-by of the theatre. Robert Edmond Jones arranged the stage settings. In 1916 a fishing smack was remodeled, christened "The Wharf

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Theatre," and with George Cram Cook as director, the group gave four programs of one-act plays. Among these were *Bound East for Cardiff* and *Thirst* by Eugene O'Neill, who became identified with the organization that gave him his first opportunity, and who acted the negro in *Thirst*. In the fall of 1916, with little money but great enthusiasm, the group rented 137 Macdougall Street, in the Village, and put on a series of nineteen one-act plays, including three by O'Neill. In 1918 they moved to 133 Macdougall Street, rebuilt a stable holding about two hundred, and despite the war, kept on producing. From the beginning the chief interest had been the playwright. According to the official list, printed by the Provincetown Theatre in 1925, the organization had produced ninety-three new plays by forty-seven playwrights, practically all American.¹ Among these were Edna St. Vincent Millay, Lewis Beach, and Edna Ferber. By 1920 they had graduated from the one-act play, and such notable productions as *The Emperor Jones*, *The Hairy Ape* and *Inheritors* were put on in 1920-2. After an interim of one season, Kenneth Macgowan, Eugene O'Neill and Robert Edmond Jones revived the organization and the character of the performances was somewhat changed. Revivals of older plays like Mrs. Mowatt's *Fashion* took place, but O'Neill's *All God's Chillun Got Wings* and *Desire Under the Elms* were the most significant productions. Although other changes came, consequent upon the leasing of the Greenwich Village Theatre by Macgowan, Jones and O'Neill, the character of the "Playwrights' Theatre" still remains. Hospitable to new ideas of stagecraft of which the dome of concrete is a testimonial, the great service to our drama has been the never faltering willingness to give an opportunity to untried playwrights whose work might otherwise not have found expression. In the season of 1926-7 the best example was the production of *In Abraham's Bosom* by Paul Green. Devotion to an ideal, with a disregard of merely com-

¹ For a glowing description of the origin of the movement, see Susan Glaspell, *The Road to the Temple*, chaps. 21, 22.

CHANGING CONDITIONS OF THE THEATRE

mercial success, an unconquerable youth, a passion for the theatre, animates every member of the staff, and gives to its business management, headed by M. Eleanor Fitzgerald, a quality of its own. The best way to estimate the significance of the Provincetown Playhouse, is to try to imagine what American playwriting would have been during the last decade without it.

One great service the independent theatres have rendered is the breaking down of the line between the professional and the amateur. The old scorn of the commercial manager for the amateur in general has suffered rude shocks, as he watched the successes of the independent theatres move to houses on Broadway and meet competition without apology. The amateur on the other hand has come to see the necessity for skilled direction, for drill and for strict attention to business. The real meaning, long obscured, of the word amateur, one who loves his art, has come into a new significance.

The decline of the road has been remedied to a certain degree by the rise of the art theatres with training schools for actors, by the establishment of "Little Theatres" and of college dramatic departments. While these have as yet produced in only a few rare cases a playwright of importance, they are raising standards of taste in some places, and in all cases are preserving the habit of theatregoing, in danger of disuse. In 1925 in the office of the Drama League of America, nineteen hundred Little Theatres were registered. There are probably three thousand such theatres, varying from the Little Theatre of Philadelphia, where "Plays and Players" owns a club house in the heart of the city, with professional director and an assured financial and social support, to the little country playhouse, with no equipment and only self-direction. But animating them all is the unquenchable love of the theatre, and their function in providing a market for the work of American playwrights is most important. Plays of merit which have been denied success in New York through accident or unfortunate circumstances have two chances of life—the stock company

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

and the little theatre, where formerly they had only one. The programs of these amateur theatres is made up of lists furnished by the leading play publishers and the demand is so great that it may be said with truth that practically every play is now published in some form. An historian of the drama alone knows how radical a change has taken place in this regard over the condition existing twenty years ago. The encouragement to playwrights is beginning to be felt and while there will probably never be a time when the ambitious playwright will not turn first to the manager who can promise a production on Broadway, there is a second public waiting, of growing discrimination, for which the dramatist may also write.

The conferences on the American drama and theatre held at the Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1925 and at Yale University in 1927 revealed the nation wide interest in drama and brought to light certain aspects of the situation which are still in process of formation. One is the growing disinclination to take the verdict of New York City as final. Experience has shown that plays which have been called failures in New York can be put on successfully in Pasadena or Cleveland, with more sympathy and less dependence upon immediate box-office returns. There was evidence, too, of a realization that matters of production, which have engaged the attention of so many college departments and Little Theatre organizations are after all subsidiary to the creation of plays. Lee Simonson, the able scenic artist, has called attention to the fact that general rules in his art are really out of the question, for each play is its own designer. And even in the electric signs, flashing on the theatres, and in the advertisements, the growing recognition of the playwright is recorded.

CHAPTER XXI

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

IT IS perhaps inevitable that when an original creative artist arises, a myth should speedily develop concerning him. It is even more inevitable when, as in the case of Eugene O'Neill, his influence extends beyond the limits of his own country and he becomes an international figure. When a playwright's work is produced in New York and Tokio, in Copenhagen and Bombay, in Prague and Manila, mistaken judgments naturally arise, caused in some cases by inability of the foreign producer to understand the meaning of the play. Perhaps the director of the Berlin production of *Anna Christie* may be pardoned some day for making Anna shoot herself. Gemier, who produced *The Emperor Jones* at the Odéon in Paris, sent a number of negroes across the stage between the scenes, to represent the chase after the Emperor. He was apparently unaware that one of the tragic elements in that play comes from the fact that the rhythmic tom-tom lures the Emperor back to the very spot at which he enters the forest, while the negroes simply wait for him to come!

It is perhaps unfair to expect foreign productions of an American dramatist to rival those in his own country, but surely his native land also has much to answer for in the growth of that "O'Neill myth" which obscures the real significance of his work. This myth is one result of the confusion of our standards of dramatic criticism, which discusses his work without apparently considering the possibility of his varying at times in his methods and often without any real understanding of the basic meaning of his art.

Like many other creative artists, he unconsciously chose the

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

training that gave him his material. Eugene Gladstone O'Neill was born October 16, 1888, on Broadway, New York. He is the son of James O'Neill, the actor of romantic and heroic parts, like *Monte Cristo*, and the first seven years of his life were spent on tour in the larger towns all over the United States. His mother, Ella Quinlan O'Neill, accompanied his father on these tours, although she had, according to O'Neill, somewhat of an aversion for the atmosphere of the stage. That the mysticism of O'Neill came to him through her is beyond question. Six years were spent in residence at Catholic boarding schools, four years at Betts Academy, Stamford, Connecticut, and then one year at Princeton University with the class of 1910. He was suspended for an infraction of college discipline and did not return after the period had expired. A year was spent as secretary of a mail-order house; then to quote his own words,¹ "Discovering a chance to work off some of my latent romanticism I went to Spanish Honduras with a mining engineer on a prospecting expedition. At the end of eight months or so I caught the malarial fever so bad that I had to be sent home. Much hardship, little romance, no gold." After a few months as assistant manager of the *White Sister* Company, in which his father was acting with Viola Allen, the urge for the sea, strengthened by the reading of Conrad and Jack London, came upon him. So he sailed for Buenos Aires on a Norwegian barque and for sixty-five days was out of sight of land. That he mentions the last fact, years later, shows how the love of adventure which widened his horizon was not really derivative from books. It was in his blood. He worked in Buenos Aires during 1910 and 1911 with the Westinghouse Electric Company, the Swift Packing Company, the Singer Sewing Machine Company, just enough to maintain existence and also tended mules on a cattle boat taking a voyage from Buenos Aires to Durban, South Africa. Upon his return he was "on the beach for a considerable period in Buenos Aires,

¹ The facts of O'Neill's life are based on letters to the present writer, supplemented by Barrett Clark's accurate biography.

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

with no job, eating and place to sleep intermittent," until he shipped as an ordinary seaman on a British tramp steamer to New York. In that city he lived at "Jimmy, the Priest's," a resort on the water front, which he uses in *Anna Christie*. After a brief period he became an able seaman on the American line steamers *New York* and *Philadelphia*. This was his last experience on the sea, but the life of the forecastle had stamped itself indelibly upon him. Joining his father in New Orleans, he played a minor part in *Monte Cristo* on the Orpheum Circuit in the West. The tour ended with O'Neill in New London, the summer home of the family. He had grown to know New England through these summer experiences and he was now to add to his knowledge by becoming a reporter on the New London *Telegraph*, visiting police courts, among other assignments. Incipient tuberculosis sent him in December, 1912, to a sanitarium, Gaylord Farm, at Wallingford, Connecticut. Here he began to take account of his varied experiences, and to decide what he wished to do. His first encouragement to write had come from his chief on the *Telegraph*, but his enforced leisure gave him the time to think things out. Being discharged soon as not seriously affected, he began to write. To quote him again, "In that winter, 1913-14, I wrote eight one-act plays and two long plays. Of these *Bound East for Cardiff* is the only one worth remembering." He was reading much in these days, especially plays, and rebuilding his health. In 1914-15 he attended Professor Baker's class at Harvard, gaining there encouragement for the future, though the plays actually written while there are of no significance. The winter of 1915-16 was spent in and around Greenwich Village, New York, observing types among the curious medley, native and foreign, there. In the summer of 1916 he went to Provincetown, Massachusetts, and there he became associated with the Provincetown Players, who produced *Bound East for Cardiff* at the Wharf Theatre.

It was a fortunate combination of playwright and actors. O'Neill would, of course, have written plays if he had never

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

met this group, but they encouraged him in an atmosphere of independence and they gave him an opportunity to experiment which the commercial theatre would probably have denied him. On the whole, he probably has given more to them than he received, but the result of the joint effort is a landmark in the history of our drama.

Of the early one-act plays which were published in 1914, *Thirst*, *The Web*, *Fog*, *Warnings*, and *Recklessness*, we are inclined to agree with O'Neill's repudiation, already quoted. They were apprentice work while he was feeling for a method. *Thirst* and *Fog* were produced by the Provincetown Players during the summers of 1916 and 1917. *Thirst* is laid on a raft in the South Seas, and has one good moment when a dancer goes mad with suffering. The best of these plays is *Warnings*, which deals with the struggle in the conscience of a wireless operator who is going deaf, between his duty to his work and his responsibility for his family. The remainder are of interest only because they are his early efforts. With *Bound East for Cardiff*, however, it is a different matter. This, the first of his plays to be produced, is also the first to be created of a series of one-act dramas in which he treated the life in the fore-castle with an imaginative quality and a reality unsurpassed. In this play he created the characters of Yank, an American sailor who is dying of injuries received by a fall, and of Driscoll, an Irishman, who is his close friend and who watches with him in his dying moments while the others snore in their bunks. Yank tells him how he had dreamed of their living together on a farm and giving up the sea, and we see the inarticulate friendship of the two sailors who have been around the world, but have seen nothing of it. The agony is not drawn out when the inevitable death comes and there is no over sentimentality. But somehow, even the little touches like the slumber of the others, who leave the loyal friend and the dying man alone as he approaches his end without fear in the fore-castle of a ship, reveal O'Neill's mastery of drama. Appropriately, too, the loyalty that comes to O'Neill's nature from

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

his Irish ancestry and the moral courage of his American present are made concrete in Driscoll and in Yank. Having established these characters, O'Neill used them in other plays, which were produced in 1917 and 1918 by the Provincetown Players in New York. *The Long Voyage Home* is laid in a dive in London. Here O'Neill depicted the tragedy of Olson, the Swedish sailor, who, determining to keep sober, in order that he may return to his native land and settle on his mother's farm, is drugged by the proprietor, robbed and carried out to the horrors of a voyage around Cape Horn in the *Amindra*, notorious for the cruelty of her officers—"the worst ship that sails the sea." The pathos of the scene becomes almost unendurable as Olson describes in simple words his longing for home, when the audience knows the doom impending over him. In *The Moon of the Caribbees* there is a vivid picture of the rough side of life on a British ship, in a West Indian harbor, especially the drunkenness and the license which come with the visit of the negresses. Against this background is painted the figure of Smitty, the English sailor, whose soul revolts at the scene, but who drinks to forget the memories which the distant music awakens in him. *In the Zone*, while theatrically more effective, is less important than the others. Smitty is suspected of being a spy during the war, and the sailors, who are nervous over the prospect of submarines, believe he has a bomb concealed in his bunk. It is only a box containing letters from the girl whom he loved and for whom he could not give up the liquor that has been his undoing. When they seize him and rifle the box there is an interesting reaction, but that is all. Of the series, *Bound East for Cardiff* is the best and when the four were given together in one program under the title of *S. S. Glencairn*, at the Provincetown Playhouse in 1924, it was illuminating to see the cumulative effect of the characterizations as the plays progressed through *The Moon of the Caribbees*, *The Long Voyage Home*, *In the Zone* and *Bound East for Cardiff*. We grew to know the characters better as each play showed how true O'Neill had kept to his types. Driscoll,

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Smitty, Olson and Yank were the most impressive, and the impulsive Irishman, the calmer Englishman, the phlegmatic Swede and the matter-of-fact American remain vividly in the memory. Those critics who speak of O'Neill as a writer of episodes were utterly confuted by the way the drama built up when the plays were put on together.

One of the best of the one-act plays, *Ile*, was produced by the Provincetown Players in 1917. This is a masterly study of the character of the captain of a whaler, revealing the iron determination which keeps him for two years in fruitless pursuit of the oil which his reputation demands he shall bring home. His wife who begs him to return, his men who threaten to mutiny, are put aside or quelled, and then, just as whales are sighted, his wife goes mad, from loneliness and the terrible effect of the ice. It is one of the earliest of the many modern plays which have dealt with the long-continued influence of climate upon human nature, and it is swift and powerful in the revelation of human reactions, when strained to the breaking point.

The other one-act plays need little comment. *Before Breakfast* (1916), which shows the influence of Strindberg, is a futile treatment of a man's suicide, off stage, driven to desperation by his wife's complaints. *The Rope* (1918) reveals the same influence, but has a theatrical situation which on account of its grim satire upon the futility of human meanness has a certain power. Luke Bentley returns to the farm to find the money he believes his half-crazy father has hidden. Out of bravado and to impress his sister and brother-in-law, Luke teaches his little step-niece, Mary, to skim a coin into the water. He then plots with his brother-in-law to rob his father, partly because old Abraham Bentley has hung a rope in the barn and told Luke to hang himself upon it. Mary swings on the rope and it gives way, pulling down with it the cherished hoard of gold pieces. Then she skips out to the cliff and skims them into the sea, while off stage Luke and his brother-in-law are plotting to torture the old man into revealing the hiding

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

place of his hoard. It is fortunate that O'Neill passed out of this stage. All that he learned from writing this play or *The Dreamy Kid* (1919), a play of negro life, was a certain stage effectiveness, and the experience of working out results from unpromising material. These early plays were studies for later productions of great value, like *The Emperor Jones* or *Desire Under the Elms*. In fact the only other one-act play that needs to be mentioned, *When the Cross Was Made*, was written to help the Provincetown program in the fall of 1918, and forms part of the play *Gold*, conceived even in the first instance as a full-length play.

Stimulating as his association with the semi-professional group at the Playwrights' Theatre had been, it was time for O'Neill to progress from the one-act play to a larger form and to a strictly professional production. The special matinee at the Morosco Theatre on February 2, 1920, marks a definite step in his career, for in *Beyond the Horizon* he challenged the attention of those who could recognize an original and powerful note in the drama. Considered superficially, the love of two brothers for the same girl is an old story. But that is not the central motive of *Beyond the Horizon*. Robert Mayo is a dreamer, a poet, to whom the humdrum life of the farm is repellent. He has visions of the adventures that lie beyond the limits one can see, and the opportunity of the voyage with his uncle comes as an answer to an unspoken prayer. As a frail child, he has been comforted by the beauty that lies in the clouds, and he hears the voices of illusion calling him. Across this dream come the homely things and the love of the two brothers, passing the usual, and then after they have said their inarticulate farewell, the wayward passion of Ruth Atkins strikes down the dream. At the insistent clutch of her fancy, Robert, who, like all the family, had believed that Andy was her chosen mate, gives up his voyage and Andy takes his place. The scene in which their father, James Mayo, pours his wrath upon Andy's head for leaving the farm and in which the two brothers say good night with their friendship riveted rather

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

than broken by the test it has undergone, is one of the finest revelations of human passion and restraint that the modern stage has seen.

The play proceeds through the inevitable results of the fatal mistake of Ruth. Robert is a failure as a farmer and his life becomes one long struggle against his wife's nagging, his mother-in-law's complaints and his own sense of inadequacy. His two consolations are his books and his little daughter. Ruth nourishes the hope of Andy's return and when Robert jestingly refers to Andy's letters which tell nothing of the places he has visited, the long-pent-up emotion bursts from her and she strips her soul of the restraint which has concealed her passion for her husband's brother. Upon his return, Andy tells Rob and Ruth separately that his passion for her was forgotten in a few months. To her it is the end of hope—to Rob, an added irritation—but Andy senses the situation and leaves them after only a day's visit. Five years later the tragedy has progressed naturally in terms of the daily routine of a decaying farm. Even after Mary's death, and with the fatal disease upon him, Rob keeps up his hope for the future. But when Andy brings the specialist who pronounces sentence, Rob breaks away from their care and they find him on the hillside watching the horizon he had never crossed. His last words strike the keynote of hope:

Robert: You mustn't feel sorry for me. Don't you see I'm happy at last—free—free!—freed from the farm—free to wander on and on—eternally! Look! Isn't it beautiful beyond the hills? I can hear the old voices calling me to come— (*Exultantly.*) And this time I'm going! It isn't the end. It's a free beginning—the start of my voyage! I've won to my trip—the right of release—beyond the horizon! Oh, you ought to be glad—glad—for my sake!

It was this exaltation of spirit which lifted *Beyond the Horizon* into greatness. O'Neill knows that the most precious gifts to humanity are the illusions that keep us alive, and he fulfills the most severe test of tragedy, which has come down to us from

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

the Greeks, that it purifies us through our sympathy with suffering. He met another test, too. The characters all stand out, not as types, but as individuals, even the two mothers, different but alive, through whom he secures a few moments of the comedy that keeps the tragedy from becoming unendurable. He does not localize the farm, and while James Mayo seems of New England, the prevailing quality is simply that of native American stock.

Beyond the Horizon is written in three acts of two scenes each. He thus made a compromise between the accepted tradition and the freer form that he was to use later. But in any case, he made the form the servant to the dramatic conception and preserved the unity of motive. By a stupid stage direction, the last scene was omitted in the production, after the first performance, and the first scene of the last Act slightly changed. The real meaning of the play was thereby obscured and in the revival in 1926 it was apparent how integral a part of the drama is the last scene. But even with that handicap the play won the Pulitzer Prize and became, after its professional run ended in Chicago, a favorite of the Little Theatres. While O'Neill went onward to conquer new fields, *Beyond the Horizon* will always remain one of his finest plays. For in it he put his own longings for adventure, which led him to South Africa and South America, which took him into the hold of a steamer and the life "on the beach." When Robert Mayo says, "Supposing I was to tell you that it's just Beauty that's calling me, the beauty of the far off and unknown," it is O'Neill himself that is speaking.

Chris Christopherson (1920), his next play to be produced, was not a success, and was later rewritten as *Anna Christie*. In the meantime he had written *The Straw*, which had to wait for production until 1921 but which belongs to the same period of composition as *Beyond the Horizon*. In *The Straw* are reflected O'Neill's experiences in the sanitarium and in newspaper work, but just as Rob Mayo was not merely a copy of O'Neill, so Stephen Murray is not simply a self-picture. Start-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

ing with a vivid portrayal of the selfishness which manifests itself in Eileen Carmody's brutal father and cowardly lover when she has to leave home on account of tuberculosis of the lungs, he reveals the growth of love in Eileen for Stephen at the sanitarium, and her despair, bravely hidden at first when she finds it unreturned. *The Straw* is essentially an acting play. Those who saw it in its brief life at the Greenwich Village Theatre will never forget the scene at midnight on the road when Eileen tells Stephen she loves him, knowing that he has only friendship to give in return. Even stronger in its appeal was the final act in the isolation room, four months later, where Eileen lies, not knowing or caring that she is to be sent on to the hospital for the incurable. On one side of the stage her bed is placed and a door separates her from the main room. Stephen comes to see her and when the nurse begs him to make Eileen's last days happy by pretending he loves her, he agrees out of gratitude for the encouragement she had given him in his writing and for the love she had offered him. So far there was simply the chivalry of a stage convention. But O'Neill provided Otto Kruger and Margalo Gillmore with a great opportunity, of which they took advantage. As Stephen begins to tell her his story, the gallant lie grows before our eyes into truth. The beauty of her nature shining out of Eileen's eyes as the light of hope comes back to them, kindles the love in Stephen that flashes into passion. But as his love is born, there comes also the realization of her fatal illness and anxiety shudders into the sense of doom. She sees it and reads her sentence in the midst of her joy, and then Stephen rises quickly to the occasion and lies again, telling her that he had to come back because he has relapsed and they will go away together. When he leaves her, shuts the door of her sleeping porch and then first begs the nurse for encouragement and finally defies her to set a limit to the hope of human happiness, he seems to be not only Stephen Murray, but the incarnation of the unquenchable spark that carries on life itself. Once

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

again, as in *Beyond the Horizon*, the tragedy ends with exaltation.

Two reworkings of earlier material, one a failure, one a great success, date from 1920, though they were not produced until 1921. O'Neill had conceived of *Gold* as a full-length drama, but he had written a one-act play, *Where the Cross Is Made*, for the Provincetown Players in 1918, and some of the characters reappear in the last act of *Gold*. In Captain Bartlett, the sailor who is obsessed by the idea that he has discovered a valuable chest of gold ornaments on a desert island in the Pacific, O'Neill drew a strong character. The action is sharper in the one-act play, but there is a powerful scene on the island, in the first act of *Gold*, which depicts the sufferings of the six men who are lost and the murder of two of them by the Kanaka with Bartlett's connivance. There was no character in *Gold*, however, in whom an audience could be vitally interested. Cupidity is death to heroism and while the relentless purpose of Captain Bartlett is a unifying force to the drama, he is not of sufficient importance to be an heroic figure. *Gold* lasted about ten nights when it was put on in June, 1921.

In *Anna Christie*, written in 1920, and produced in 1921, O'Neill worked over the material of *Chris*. In the earlier version the central character had been that of a Swedish sailor and he was carried over in part to the later play. While he remains in fact the best character in *Anna Christie*, he becomes second in importance to his daughter, and the play must be judged by the treatment of her character. The first act of *Anna Christie* is one of the most skilfully constructed scenes in all O'Neill's plays. His experiences in "Jimmy the Priest's" saloon blossom into the stark reality of "Johnny the Priest's," with the bar on one side of the stage separated by a partition from the back room, into which the "family entrance" opens. Chris Christopherson is a perfect portrait of a tough old seaman who has wasted his life and who has kept his daughter out on a farm in the West because he wishes to guard her against "dat ole davil, sea," upon which he blames all his misfortunes.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Just as he has finished building up an idyllic portrait of Anna, growing up in a state of pastoral innocence, largely for the benefit of Marthy, a drab whom he has been keeping on his coal barge, Anna enters the back room. Chris has gone out for a few minutes leaving Marthy alone, and when Anna enters, drops her suit case and says, "Gimme a whisky—ginger ale on the side," we have one of those sharp moments when reality crashes into a mental picture. The conversation between the two women is exposition of the highest order. When Marthy, irritated by Anna's tone, snaps out, "I got your number the minute you stepped in the door," Anna replies, "Ain't you smart! Well, I got yours, too, without no trouble. You're me, forty years from now."

The only criticism that may be leveled at the first Act is that O'Neill so clearly draws Anna's character that it is difficult for him to make us believe in her regeneration. It is, of course, natural that she should conceal her past from her father and that when Mat Burke, the giant Irish stoker, appears over the side of the coal barge out of the fog, she should like his sincere if possessive style of wooing. The second Act, in which Anna seems to be cleansed through the healing influence of the sea and the fog that blots out the past she hates, is one of O'Neill's touches of poetic symbolism that makes a strong appeal. If he had been able to preserve that note he might have made a greater play, but the sense of reality brought him back to the three characters as purely human and while their relations are developed naturally and their conversation is startlingly faithful to actual life, the play at the end is disappointing. Treated symbolically, we may believe in Anna's regeneration; treated realistically, we do not credit the retention of the inherent purity necessary to that regeneration. It is true that she is far superior to Laura Murdock in *The Easiest Way*. She does not take any lofty attitude—she is merely defiant of the two men who try to decide what is to become of her and while she feels that the cards of fate have been stacked against her from the beginning, she blames no

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

one. O'Neill has himself explained that he felt such a woman could express herself only in terms of theatrical language she had learned from the novels and moving pictures with which she was familiar. She is honest in confessing her past when Burke wishes to marry her and the departure of the two men to get drunk as the only avenue open to them to forget the wreck her story has made of their lives is fine irony. So is their signing up, while drunk, upon the same ship for a long cruise. If Anna's character is not entirely defensible, the criticism that the play was forced into a happy ending is puerile. In a letter to the *New York Times*¹ O'Neill says:

Not even the most adversely prejudiced could call this a "happy ending." Meaning that I wish it understood as unhappy? Meaning nothing of the kind. Meaning what I have said before, that the play has no ending. Three characters have been revealed in all their intrinsic verity, under the acid test of a fateful crisis in their lives. They have solved this crisis for the moment as best they may, in accordance with the will that is in each of them. The curtain falls. Behind it their lives go on. But granting for the moment the absurdity that the ending is happy, why the objections to it raised on all sides? Have I not been told constantly that gloom is my failing, that I should see the brighter side, that I should grant my helpless human beings their one hundred per cent right to happiness? Well, in *Anna Christie*, haven't I? You claim I have and yet you will have none of it. You say it is unconvincing. Why? Is it, as I suspect, on moral grounds? Does the idea that two such "disreputable" folk as Anna and Burke are, as you think, going to be happy, disturb your sense of the proper fitness of things in this best of all possible worlds? Or is your reason, as I more than suspect, simply that you prefer the obvious to the inevitable? It would have been so obvious and easy—in the case of this play, conventional even—to have made my last Act a tragic one. It could have been done in ten different ways, any one of them superficially right. But looking deep into the hearts of my people, I saw it couldn't be done. It would not have been true. They were not that kind. They would act in just the silly, immature, compromising way that I have made them act; and I thought that they would appear to others as they do to me, a bit tragically humorous in their vacillating weakness. But evi-

¹Dated December 12, 1921.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

dently not. Evidently they are all happy—and unconvincing. No wonder! Their groping clutch at happiness is taken as a deadly finality.

But how about those sentimental ones to whom the Boy on the Burning Deck represents the last word in the heroic spirit our drama should strive to express—the American *Œdipus Rex*? Surely they must read something into my ending besides mere eternal happiness. But they don't. And yet there never was a more sentimental gesture of defiance at fate than that of Burke and Anna agreeing to wed.

Lastly, to those who think I deliberately distorted my last Act because a "happy ending" would be calculated to make the play more of a popular success I have only this to say: The sad truth is that you have precedents enough and to spare in the history of our drama for such a suspicion. But, on the other hand, you have every reason not to believe it of me.

O'Neill might have added, in his defence, that Matt Burke is just the kind of man who might help Anna in her upward struggle. He is the compound of two qualities which the Irish of his stamp possess—a worship of the purity of woman, and a superlative self-conceit. He believes he is the kind who can save her—perhaps he can—for it is of his kind, infinitely spiritualized, that the saints are made. If he fails, we may be sure that he will reproach her all their lives together.

Dates of production are less significant in O'Neill's case than dates of composition.¹ *The Emperor Jones* was produced before *Anna Christie*, by the Provincetown Players, November 1, 1920. But it marks a progress in O'Neill's art. In it he discarded any attempt at arrangement into acts, and dealt with the theme progressively in eight scenes. He also defied the old theatrical rule against monologue and created a moving and enthralling drama which is largely carried on by the utterances of one character. For this central character he chose no usual hero, but a negro Pullman car porter, who has had to leave the United States on account of his crimes, which include murder. The nature of this man is established

¹ See list of O'Neill's plays, arranged according to year of their composition; program of the Greenwich Village Theatre, 1925-6.

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

in the first scene, laid in the audience chamber of the "Emperor Jones," on a West Indian island, "not yet self-determined by white marines." The conversation between Jones, who has won his imperial dignity by his cleverness in imposing upon the natives, and a low-caste British trader, Smithers, is carried on in that natural manner of which O'Neill is a master. Instinctive dislike to both men comes first and then a gradual dawning of respect for the ability and courage of Jones, who, single-handed, holds the island in his grip. He has won his position by an unscrupulous employment of the devices he has learned "on de Pullman ca's listenin' to de white quality talk." To these he has added his own contribution, a skilful playing upon the superstitious fears of the negroes. He has taken advantage of the fact that when one of his enemies shot at him, the bullet missed fire, and he has told them that nothing but a silver bullet can kill him. When Smithers remarks that this is luck, Jones answers: "I got brains and I uses 'em quick. Dat ain't luck." But Smithers has news for him. His time has come; the negroes have deserted the Emperor. And then "from the distant hills comes the faint steady thump of a tom-tom, low and vibrating. It starts at a rate exactly corresponding to normal pulse beat—seventy-two to the minute—and continues at a gradually accelerating rate from this point uninterruptedly to the very end of the play." This device, not unknown to the theatre, has probably never elsewhere been used so effectively. It is a unifying force and it accentuates the needed mood in both character and audience, for it goes back to the primitive expression of emotion, the accentuated rhythm of the earliest race. Jones wins our admiration by his quick decision to leave and by his courage in going out by the front entrance. "De Emperor Jones leaves de way he comes, and dat black trash don't dare stop him." From the second to the seventh scene we watch the flight of the Emperor through the "brooding implacable silence" of the forest, on the other side of which lies safety and the gold he has deposited in the foreign bank. In each

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

scene he encounters phantoms deepening in intensity and mystery and receding from the present into the prenatal stages of his being. In scene two, they are the "little formless fears" of his imagining. He dispels them with a shot from his revolver, loaded with five lead bullets and one of silver which he is keeping for himself if he is caught. In scene three he sees Jeff, the negro porter he had killed in a quarrel, and he talks to him, as he does to himself, in the natural monologue of a negro under the stress of emotion, until the shot dispels the vision again. In scene four, the murder of the white convict guard is re-enacted, and again the tension is increased. Tattered and worn, he stumbles, in the fifth scene, to a clearing, where he sees the vision of a slave auction in the fifties, and is himself sold as a slave. Then comes the apparition of the slave ship, with the negroes' slow rhythmic motion, like the roll of a vessel, which he is forced to join. The seventh scene takes him back to the Congo, to a dance of sacrifice and death, led by the Witch Doctor, who after raising the pitch of the scene to an almost unbearable note of intensity, summons the crocodile god from the river, and motions Jones to become the needed sacrifice. Jones has been hypnotized but he calls on the Lord and thinks of his one remaining silver bullet. He shoots the crocodile and falls on the ground.

For the last scene we return to the edge of the forest where Jones entered it. The negroes have simply waited for him, knowing he would make a circle in the woods. The tom-tom beats remorselessly and in the conversation between Lem, their leader, and Smithers, we learn that they have moulded silver bullets to break the charm. Four shots are heard and the body of the Emperor is brought in. Smithers has already pronounced his funeral oration: "'E's a better man than the lot of you put together. I 'ates the sight of him but I'll say that for 'im."

It is a fine thing for an art when a creative master shatters conventions and thereby makes for freedom. O'Neill went back to a freer form, he defied the ordinary rules of technique, but

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

he did not violate the fundamental laws of drama. He kept the unity of time; he violated the unity of place; but he substituted a higher unity—that of impression. *The Emperor Jones* is a drama of human fear; the emotion of terror is a binding force that fuses the scenes into an unforgettable picture of a human soul fighting against his own evil deeds, the cruel fate of his forefathers, the ignorance of centuries. Variety, too, is secured by the varying shades in the intensity of terror, and the originality of the whole conception of the play.

The Emperor Jones made O'Neill's position secure. After its run on Macdougall Street, it went uptown and was taken on tour. The chief rôle has been interpreted by negroes like Charles Gilpin and Paul Robeson and by white actors like Rutherford Mayne, in Dublin, and has never failed to impress an audience. For notwithstanding the crimes of the Emperor, there is something royal in his nature, something pitiful in his hopeless struggle against fate, which elicits our sympathy.

Diff'rent followed *Jones* at the Provincetown on December 27, 1920, but it was of far less significance. It is a study of the woman who, having had a high ideal of what her husband should be, finds that her betrothed sailor is like other sailors and declines to marry him. Then thirty years later, having been sexually starved, she throws herself at the head of a young soldier just returned from the Great War. Her lover of thirty years who has remained unmarried, sees his ideal crash and hangs himself. She goes down to the barn apparently to follow him. *Diff'rent*, of all the long plays, shows most clearly the influence of Strindberg, and it is the poorest. There is no one who excites our interest except for a few minutes in the first Act and the play can be looked upon only as an experiment whose result is distressing.

The First Man, although produced at the Neighborhood Playhouse March 4, 1922, is spoken of in a letter from O'Neill, dated February 5, as "one of the vintage of a year and a half ago." On the stage the play never had a chance. The newspapers harped upon a minor feature, the moaning of a mother

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

in giving birth to a child, which as a matter of fact, was not stressed in the production, and the impression was created that the play was obscene. It is not one of O'Neill's best plays but it has some interesting rewards for the close student of his work. It is laid in a small New England city, and a vivid picture is given of the narrow-minded, suspicious natures of the Jayson family, whose sole concern in life is the preservation of their own importance. They are not merely types. As they come down from the generations of finer mettle, they swell into pomposity like John Jayson, or grow sharp in disappointment, like Lily. The most lovable is old Mrs. Davidson, the grand-aunt. Curtis Jayson, the only one who has gone out into a freer atmosphere, has become an anthropologist and is about to start on an expedition to find the first traces of mankind. He is absorbed in his work, and his wife, Martha, who helps him, is set against the background of the petty souls who turn on her with the tribal instinct of the insect. When she tells her husband that she is to have a child, he rebels, for he has grown to look upon her not as a mother but as his helpmate. This reluctance on his part is misinterpreted by his family as a doubt of the real parentage of the coming infant and they suspect an affair between Martha and Curtis' best friend, Biglow. Martha dies in childbirth and Curtis' dislike turns to hatred and he refuses to see his boy. But when he finds out what is in their minds, he rushes up to his son, brings him down and showing his scorn of their suspicions, gives the child to Mrs. Davidson, and departs.

The trouble with *The First Man* is that we do not believe in Curtis Jayson. The natural instinct of a father, the attitude taken by any human being toward his wife during confinement, cannot be so completely obliterated or even changed without removing our sympathy for the man. The rival claims of a profession and of love or family life may be a fit theme for dramatic treatment, but O'Neill pushed the contrast too far. It was a pity, for there is good writing in the frame-

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

work, and a satirical comedy in the first Act rare in O'Neill's plays.

O'Neill is a conscious artist. In a letter of February 5, 1922, he speaks of *The Hairy Ape*, whose rehearsals he was attending, as "a much greater departure in form than *Jones*." It is not only in form that the progression has taken place. *The Hairy Ape* is symbolism. Yank, the stoker in an ocean liner, represents force, which if unguided, may wreck the world, but out of which all that is significant must grow. It is "a comedy of ancient and modern life" and in Yank we can see the primitive man,—*"I kin make a bluff at talkin' and t'inkin'—a'most git away wit it—a'most!—and dat's where de joker comes in."* To consider any of the scenes for themselves alone, from the forecastle and the stokehole, to the jail and the Zoological Garden, is to mistake the meaning of the play. O'Neill specifically states in the stage directions of the first scene, "The treatment of this scene, or of any other scene in the play, should by no means be naturalistic." He is showing the struggle of the primitive man upward and endeavoring to depict, in terms of modern institutions, the terrible struggle through which the race went, in beginning the processes of mental growth. It is akin to Moody's lyric of the polyp: "legs he will sprout, in spite of threats and jokes."

The stage pictures were something new in drama. The first scene, in the stokehole, crashed upon the auditor without apology. It was a carnival of force, expressed in terms of human beings, at first indistinguishable units in a chorus of international profanity. Then there emerged the dominant personality of Yank, the strongest man, who "belongs," who makes the ship go—emblem of the force that makes the world go on. He has no resentment at first for the rich or the idle; he scorns the cheap agitator, for Yank rejoices in his strength—even in the living hell of the stokehole he has solved the problem of humanity, to be content with his job. Against this background of tumult O'Neill then sounds, through the old Irish stoker, his marvelous requiem for the gallant old days of

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the sailing ships, beginning: "There was fine beautiful ships them days—fine strong men in them—men that was sons of the sea as if 'twas the mother that bore them." For him, Yank has only amused toleration. But into this content, which symbolizes stagnation, comes the divine discontent that causes progress. Mildred Douglas, the neurotic poser, the daughter of the owner of the steel trust, is also a symbol. Her look of horror when she sees Yank, cursing out his defiance to the engineer, stirs in Yank the desire for something of which he had not dreamed. She does not call him a "hairy ape," but Pat, the stoker, coins the phrase, which O'Neill, indeed, had used in *The Moon of the Caribbees*. Yank translates his discontent into terms of revenge upon her and what she symbolizes. But everywhere he is rebuffed; the symbolic procession on Fifth Avenue is hardly conscious of him, the I. W. W. rejects him, and when he seeks the gorilla, the real hairy ape, and frees him, in order that they may in friendly brotherhood seek the meaning of the power they possess, the gorilla crushes him to death. *The Hairy Ape* may be open to criticism on the score that since it is impossible in any case to represent the profanity adequately, it is unnecessary to stress it quite so much for the purposes of art. But the cumulative effect is that of tremendous power. There is no drama of futility here; it is the representation of profound forces, wrought by a thinker who has gone back to the primal strivings of the race.

Welded, written in 1923, is a study of the conflict between two souls whose power to torture each other is measured only in terms of their great mutual passion. The theme is dramatic, for in every marriage there comes the time when husband and wife struggle for the preservation of that identity which marriage naturally seems to threaten. The situation in *Welded* is rendered more intense by the fact that Michael Cape is a playwright and Eleanor is an actress who has interpreted his work. They are temperamental in the extreme and their union is haunted, against their own wills, by the ghosts of other relations before their marriage, although they believe them-

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

selves to be emancipated from such old-fashioned scruples. When the conflict comes to a head, each strives to hurt the other to the last degree. Eleanor goes to the man of whom Michael is most jealous, but he sees she does not love him and brings her back. Michael goes to a prostitute, but cannot bring himself to the actual commission of any breach of loyalty to Eleanor, and leaves the woman puzzled by his apparently insane behavior. In the actual performance this scene was the most effective one, possibly because the leading actress, who was playing Eleanor without any apparent understanding of the part, was not on the stage. The entire interpretation, in fact, was inadequate, yet even in the reading, the subtle interplay of emotion flashes almost too quickly. But there are fine moments in *Welded*. When after their return and apparent reconciliation the old struggle comes up again, Eleanor goes to the door to leave her husband. But "*she raises her hand and knocks on the door softly—then stops to listen. In a far-away voice she speaks. No. Never again, 'come out.' She opens the door and turns to Cape with a strange smile. It opens inward, Michael.*" Both come to a realization that "*it is impossible that they should ever deny life, through each other, again.*" But one is not certain that the fusion has been complete.

During the spring of 1924 there was produced at the Provincetown Theatre, a dramatization by O'Neill of *The Ancient Mariner*. While it was not a popular success, the experiment was interesting, for the dramatic qualities of Coleridge's poem were made evident. The Ancient Mariner waits outside the house in which the wedding is to take place and as the Wedding Guest approaches, he demands his attention and proceeds to tell him the story. The scenes are then portrayed on the back stage while the Mariner describes and narrates in front. Perhaps the most definite impression carried away from the rehearsal which I attended was O'Neill's knowledge of the sea, evidenced by his direction of the sailors, and the greater

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

stage effect their actions produced after he had shown them how things were really done on shipboard.

The Fountain, while not produced until 1925, was written during 1921-2, and represents an experiment in romantic symbolism. In Juan Ponce de Leon, O'Neill has not attempted to follow an historical character. He has made of him a symbol of the search for the fountain of eternal youth, who will sacrifice even love for ambition and who is more concerned for the glory of Spain than for the faith which Columbus is desirous of planting in the New World. The second scene, on the deck of the flagship of Columbus on the last day of his second voyage, was a stirring spectacle. The struggle between the ideas of national glory and of the crusading spirit was kept concrete by the brief but telling clash between Ponce de Leon and Columbus. Then as the dawning vision of the New World bursts on the ship, all kneel, each with the cross that is the symbol of their faith: for Columbus, the cross of Christ; for Juan de Leon, the sword of Spain. In a brief scene, O'Neill dramatized the two forces that settled America, but the very excellence of the scene made it difficult to rise again to the same height of theatrical effectiveness.

There is, however, a definite growth in Juan's character as we see him twenty years later, governor of Porto Rico. He is disillusioned by the struggle to reconcile the warring elements. "I have fought small things so long that I am small," he tells Luis, the Dominican friar. And then Beatriz de Cordova comes to him, as his ward, the daughter of the dead woman who had loved him, with this message:

Beatriz: "Bring him tenderness," she said. "That will repay the debt I owe him for saving me for you."—She said these words were secrets to tell you alone. What did she mean, Don Juan?

O'Neill deftly combines in Juan's mind his search for the Fountain of Youth for its own sake with the hope of becoming young again in order that he may win the love of Beatriz. It is a good stroke, too, to make Nano, the Indian, guide the

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

Spaniards apparently for profit, but really for revenge. The vision of Juan at the fountain, where his expedition comes to ruin, is symbolic and poetically effective. The song which has been the *motif* of the play:

Love is a flower
Forever blooming,
Life is a fountain
Forever leaping
Upward to catch the golden sunlight,
Upward to reach the azure heaven.
Failing, falling
Ever returning,
To kiss the earth that the flower may live

changes its note. He sees Beatriz and hears her voice:

God is a flower
Forever blooming,
God is a fountain
Forever flowing—

and he recognizes the real meaning of the Fountain of Eternal Life, "the Eternal Becoming which is Beauty."

The last scene is very human in the requiem it preaches over vanity. Juan has been saved and brought to Cuba. He is waiting for Beatriz to tell her how he had loved her and how it is all over for him. Then when she comes it is to bring with her another Don Juan, his nephew, and in a flash, Juan sees how it is between them. He smiles at them; then he says briefly, "You have stolen my last gesture," and dies in an ecstasy, having found the Fountain of Eternity. It is to be regretted that *The Fountain* did not have a longer life, for it revealed O'Neill's love of beauty, and it is written on a high poetic level. The production was fatally lacking in the casting of Juan, who was played by an actor extremely capable in domestic drama, but apparently incapable of expressing heroic parts.

To those who have failed to see O'Neill's underlying pur-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

pose, it would seem a far cry from *The Fountain* to *All God's Chillun Got Wings*, written in 1923 and produced in May, 1924, at the Provincetown Playhouse. In it and *Desire Under the Elms* he seemed to search for the most repellent themes and characters. Upon first reading *All God's Chillun* the reaction is unfavorable. The subject is forbidding. Literature has usually been content to represent the result of the mating of the white and the negro race as a tragic consequence to the next generation, but it has spared us the actual miscegenation. O'Neill has boldly set precedent at naught and even to those who approached the play with natural prejudice, the character of Jim Harris, as represented by Paul Robeson, gripped the sympathy on account of his hopeless striving for the unattainable. The mating of the negro with the white girl Ella Downey was not treated suggestively and the message, if there was any, seemed to be the hopelessness of amalgamation of the races. But the play was distinctly not propaganda. It was a tragedy of aspiration on Jim's part and Ella was only a concrete symbol of that aspiration. The tragedy was deepened because Jim chose some one who did not understand anything of his aspiration, who was spiritually beneath him, while she was racially above him. The white students who are his rivals in the Bar examination start on a higher level just as Ella does, and Jim's fine qualities cannot keep him on an equality with that level. All his strength is exhausted in simply reaching for it. The madness of Ella Downey, well portrayed on the stage, was conveyed by natural soliloquy. She was just the kind of person who would talk to herself under those circumstances. It was not like the old stage soliloquy, a device to give information to the audience. It was self-revelation.

Desire Under the Elms, written and produced in November, 1924, at the Greenwich Village Theatre, and after transfer uptown, continuing until October, 1925, has been one of the most provocative of discussion of O'Neill's plays. The unthinking saw in it a coarse discussion of lust; some inhabitants of New England resented it as a distortion of sectional char-

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

acter. O'Neill, of course, is not concerned with either of these aspects of the drama. Like *The Hairy Ape*, it is a study of human strength, misguided in its concrete results, but inevitable as a by-product of the development of power. When asked if he felt that he had represented New England fairly he replied with a smile, "I know the country pretty well, I grew up in it—and I reported the police news in a Connecticut town." But New England should not have been so sensitive about *Desire*, for O'Neill had no intention of reflecting on any section of the country. He writes about New England because he likes to write about what he knows, but his themes are really universal. The urge of the Spring, of the warm earth which every character in the play feels, which prompts Ephraim Cabot, at seventy-five, to take a third wife, which sends his two older sons to California, which inflames the passion of Abbie Cabot for the son of Ephraim's second marriage, and Eben Cabot's reciprocal desire for her, is not merely of New England; it is drawn from life. There is a hardness, in Ephraim's nature, akin to granite which lifts him into heroic size. In one sense, he is the Puritan, with the spirituality gone, but with the indomitable will to conquer the stony farm, to make it pay, to keep it, and even when he had had the prospect of easier living, to return to it because he liked a hard task. When the sheriff comes for Abbie after she has murdered the child she has borne to Eben, Ephraim tells her: "He'd ought t' been my son, Abbie. Ye'd ought t' loved me. I'm a man. If ye'd loved me, I'd never told no sheriff on ye no matter what ye did, if they was t' brile me alive."

The play radiates from him. Eben is a compound of his father's craving for possession of the farm and the softer nature his mother bequeathed to him. He and his brothers hate their father for his tyranny, but Ephraim has been the binding force of the family. The very animals know him best and he goes to sleep with them when the human beings seem unbearable.

There can be little doubt that Greek tragedy had its influ-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

ence upon *Desire*. The horror of Abbie's murder of her child, in order that she may prove to Eben, by removing the only other heir to the farm, that she loves Eben best, causes us to shudder as we do at some of the situations in Greek drama, but there is not the self-torturing introspection that in the Scandinavian drama prefaces suicide or murder. If O'Neill does not succeed in endowing Abbie's action with the dignity of the Greek, it is because he has so thoroughly convinced us of the purely carnal nature of her passion. He has not succeeded in making her a great figure as he has made Ephraim. Eben also is not quite convincing, but the stage presentation of Eben was not even physically true to O'Neill's text, while Walter Huston gave as thoroughly satisfactory a performance in the part of Ephraim as he later failed to give, in *The Fountain*, a real picture of Don Juan. The stage setting of *Desire*, in which the four rooms of the house were shown in cross section, enabled two or three scenes to be enacted simultaneously. We could watch the dance going on below to celebrate the birth of an heir, while above Eben sat brooding and then joined Abbie in bending over the cradle of the son for whose advent Ephraim is rejoicing. The result is generally ironic, and it is not at all certain that the freedom thus secured compensates for the distracting influence of the stage setting.

With *The Great God Brown*, produced January 23, 1926, at the Greenwich Village Theatre, symbolism became triumphant. In the concrete play, there are four characters: Dion Anthony, an artist, Billy Brown, a successful architect and builder, Margaret Anthony, the wife of Dion, whom Billy has always loved, and Cybel, a prostitute. From the beginning of the play, at the dance after their graduation from school, Dion wears a mask, that of a handsome mocking sensualist, to conceal his real nature, too sensitive to stand the misunderstanding of the world. Margaret loves him as his mask reveals him, the poet and brilliant dreamer, and she, without ever understanding him, bears him children, mothers him and protects his reputation from the world. She even pretends to herself

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

that he does not visit Cybel, the prostitute. She is loyal, as Dion says, to her vanity. Cybel sees Dion without his mask, she takes off hers in his presence, and their scenes together contain some of the most striking lines in the play—such as her words to him—“(stroking his hair maternally) You were born with ghosts in your eyes and you were brave enough to go looking into your own dark—and you got afraid.” But even more powerful is the scene in which Dion reveals to Brown his inner nature: “I’ve been life’s lover! I’ve fulfilled her will and if she’s through with me now it’s only because I was too weak to dominate her in turn. It isn’t enough to be her creature, you’ve got to create her or she requests you to destroy yourself.”

It is the cry of the creative artist again, and the bitter words with which Dion tells Brown how life has really passed him by though the world thinks him a success, are terrible in their truth. Then Dion dies, leaving Brown his mask. Brown takes it and Margaret thinks he is Dion. It is a revenge which no one but O'Neill would have conceived. The struggle between the dual natures in Brown now tears him in pieces as it has rended Dion. With one mask on he is Brown the successful architect, but hard pressed by the loss of Dion who has been the genius of the firm. With the other mask on he is Dion, “in paradise by proxy,” pursued by God and by himself, till he can stand the torture no longer and welcomes the shot of the police who believe he is the murderer of Brown. Cybel comes to warn him of the pursuit and he dies in her arms. “I don’t want justice,” he begs; “I want love.” “There is only love,” she answers. And after Brown has died with the “Our Father, Who Art” upon his lips she bursts forth with the requiem:

Always spring comes again bearing life! Always again! Always, always forever again!—Spring again!—life again!—summer and fall and death and peace again!—(with agonized sorrow)—but always, always, love and conception and birth and pain again—spring bearing the intolerable chalice of life again!—(then with

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

agonized exultance)—bearing the glorious, blazing crown of life again! (*She stands like an idol of Earth, her eyes staring out over the world.*)

It is this speech and the heartbroken cry of Margaret, "My lover, my husband and my boy!" that remain most vividly from the performance of the play. Notwithstanding the novelty of the masks, the audience quickly responded to their symbolism and the concrete tragedy, with its final note of exaltation, held the theatre spellbound for months.

As for the underlying meaning, it would be impertinent for anyone to substitute his interpretation for that of the author. O'Neill has given it as follows:

I realize that when a playwright takes to explaining he thereby automatically places himself "in the dock." But where an open-faced avowal by the play itself of the abstract theme underlying it is made impossible by the very nature of that hidden theme, then perhaps it is justifiable for the author to confess the mystical pattern which manifests itself as an overtone in *The Great God Brown*, dimly behind and beyond the words and actions of the characters.

I had hoped the names chosen for my people would give a strong hint of this. (An old scheme, admitted—Shakespeare and multitudes since.) Dion Anthony—Dionysus and St. Anthony—the creative pagan acceptance of life, fighting eternal war with the masochistic, life-denying spirit of Christianity as represented by St. Anthony—the whole struggle resulting in this modern day in mutual exhaustion—creative joy in life for life's sake frustrated, rendered abortive, distorted by morality from Pan into Satan, into a Mephistopheles mocking himself in order to feel alive; Christianity, once heroic in martyrs for its intense faith now pleading weakly for intense belief in anything, even Godhead itself. (In the play it is Cybele, the pagan Earth Mother, who makes the assertion with authority: "Our Father, Who Art!" to the dying Brown, as it is she who tries to inspire Dion Anthony with her certainty in life for its own sake.)

Margaret is my image of the modern direct descendant of the Marguerite of *Faust*—the eternal girl-woman with a virtuous simplicity of instinct, properly oblivious to everything but the means to her end of maintaining the race.

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

Cybel is an incarnation of Cybele, the Earth Mother doomed to segregation as a pariah in a world of unnatural laws but patronized by her segregators who are thus themselves the first victims of their laws.

Brown is the visionless demi-god of our new materialistic myth—a Success—building his life of exterior things, inwardly empty and resourceless, an uncreative creature of superficial pre-ordained social grooves, a by-product forced aside into slack waters by the deep main current of life-desire.

Dion's mask of Pan which he puts on as a boy is not only a defense against the world for the supersensitive painter-poet underneath it but also an integral part of his character as the artist. The world is not only blind to the man beneath but it also sneers at and condemns the Pan-mask it sees. After that Dion's inner self retrogresses along the line of Christian resignation until it partakes of the nature of the Saint while at the same time the outer Pan is slowly transformed by his struggle with reality into Mephistopheles. It is as Mephistopheles he falls stricken at Brown's feet after having condemned Brown to destruction by willing him his mask, but, this mask falling off as he dies, it is the Saint who kisses Brown's feet in abject contrition and pleads as **a little boy to a big brother to tell him a prayer.**

Brown has always envied the creative life force in Dion—what he himself lacks. When he steals Dion's mask of Mephistopheles he thinks he is gaining the power to live creatively while in reality he is only stealing that creative power made self-destructive by complete frustration. This devil of mocking doubt makes short work of him. It enters him, rending him apart, torturing and transfiguring him until he is even forced to wear a mask of his Success, William A. Brown, before the world, as well as Dion's mask toward wife and children. Thus Billy Brown becomes not himself to anyone. And thus he partakes of Dion's anguish—more poignantly, for Dion had the Mother, Cybele—and in the end out of this anguish his soul is born, a tortured Christian soul such as the dying Dion's, begging for belief, and at the last finding it on the lips of Cybel.

And now for an explanation regarding this explanation. It was far from my idea in writing *Brown* that this background pattern of conflicting tides in the soul of Man should ever overshadow and thus throw out of proportion the living drama of the recognizable human beings, Dion, Brown, Margaret and Cybel. I meant it always to be mystically within and behind them, giving

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

them a significance beyond themselves, forcing itself through them to expression in mysterious words, symbols, actions they do not themselves comprehend. And that is as clearly as I wish an audience to comprehend it. It is Mystery—the mystery any one man or woman can feel but not understand as the meaning of any event—or accident—in any life on earth. And it is this mystery I want to realize in the theatre. The solution, if there ever be any, will probably have to be produced in a test tube and turn out to be discouragingly undramatic.

Marco Millions, published in 1927, but written before *The Great God Brown*, is a satiric romance, simpler than the latter in its symbolism. In *Marco Polo*, O'Neill has taken the spirit of business enterprise, willing to run risks for the sake of great gain, and while giving it a tinge of splendor has shown the deadly blindness of its materialism. As usual, however, the lesson is submerged in the dramatic portrayal, and *Marco Millions* is a series of gorgeous, barbaric scenes, through which the arch-trader, Marco Polo, progresses from youth to middle age. The Prologue, in which the dead body of the Princess Kukachin is being brought back to Cathay for burial, lifts the play out of the usual into a realm where anything may happen. It seems quite natural in that vast Persian plain to have her lips move and give this message—"Say this, I loved and died. Now I am love, and live. And living, have forgotten. And loving, can forgive." The lashing of the human beings to the chariot, since the camels have failed, and the quick whirl of fate, by which the Captain forces the three merchants to take the places of the three peasants already driven to death, strikes just the right note of barbarism, of the utter disregard of human life, which tinges the satire with deeper irony. Ironic, too, is the love of Princess Kukachin for Marco Polo, which he does not return, because in him the eternal bourgeois respects her as a thing set apart. He is true to his own Venetian maiden, Donata, not physically but sentimentally, and it is not so much fidelity as limitation which bids him keep his faith. O'Neill succeeds in keeping our interest in his hero notwithstanding his crudity, his mercantile proclivities and his failure

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

to respond to the beauty and mystery that surround him. For he has given him courage, fidelity to his word, and an innate sense of power to meet emergencies. If he is a rascal, he is, like the Emperor Jones, an able rascal, and he has the love of adventure which animated Robert Mayo in a different way. There is enough story, too, about an interesting hero and heroine to keep the sympathy of the reader or auditor.

But *Marco Millions* is more than a story of frustrated love and successful business. From the point of view of mere locality, O'Neill frees himself even more completely than in *The Fountain* from his own experience and establishes his right to be called a world dramatist. But in another sense he remains at home, for the setting is the human soul. He has shown again how futile is the attempt to limit genius by geography, for he has caught adequately for symbolic purposes the spirit of the East. Kukachin and Marco are the representatives of the two worlds, which fronted each other in the Thirteenth Century. The patrician princess, her father the Kaan, and the lesser characters, represent the East, infinitely longer in experience, distrusting through its very knowledge its own beliefs and seeking wisdom from a younger civilization, which gives it through its trading pioneers like Marco and his relative, only materialism. To O'Neill the poet, the East is a flower breaking after sleep through the sun-baked soil of centuries to ask refreshment from a new sky of inspiration and in return meeting only a hailstorm of efficiency and common sense. If *The Great Divide* represented a new philosophy of the conflict between the East and West in the United States, O'Neill has dramatized in a fresh and vital manner the age-long difference between the East and West of the world. Those who still speak of O'Neill as depressing, should read the noble scene in which Kublai Kaan mourns over the dead body of his beloved grandchild. Whether the form be prose or verse it throbs with rhythm:

Kublai: In silence—for one concentrated moment—be proud of life! Know in your heart that the living of life can be noble!

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Know that the dying of death can be noble! Be exalted by life! Be inspired by death! Be humbly proud! Be proudly grateful! Be immortal because life is immortal. Contain the harmony of womb and grave within you! Possess life as a lover—then sleep requited in the arms of death! If you awake, love again! If you sleep on, rest in peace! Who knows which? What does it matter? It is nobler not to know!

Chronicler:

We lament the shortness of life. Life at its longest is brief enough.

Too brief for the wisdom of joy, too long for the knowledge of sorrow.

Sorrow becomes despair when death comes to the young, untimely.

As I write this, *Lazarus Laughed* has not been produced or published and out of respect for the confidence which has permitted me to read the manuscript, I can deal with it only in general terms, especially so far as its highly original technique is concerned. I regret this the more as I believe it to be the most truly poetic and the most highly imaginative of O'Neill's plays. It is symbolic and becomes the climax so far of that phase of his work which begins with *The Fountain* and proceeds through *Marco Millions* and *The Great God Brown*.

It is a daring and successful attempt to dramatize the life of Lazarus, after his return from the grave. He becomes the symbol of Love and Joy that conquer Death. His message, delivered in the most impressive moments of the drama, is "There is no Death." Laughter, one of the most distinctly human of attributes, which helps to distinguish us from the other animals, is made the keynote of Lazarus' passage from the gates of Death to his glorious martyrdom. He is revealed in a series of gorgeous scenes, conquering by the power of his personality the paganism of Greece and Rome, until the Empire, in the person of Tiberius, yields to his spell and grovels for a moment at his feet. In a mystical way, which cannot be revealed without extensive quotation, Lazarus conquers by the power of Love. He has looked once into the eyes of Christ

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

and they have smiled at each other, for they know the secret. He carries the Spirit of Christ to a world not yet ready for it, and one of the best touches in the play is the way in which Lazarus recognizes how soon the human race forgets the lofty moments of its spiritual exaltation under the press of fear and selfishness.

Caligula is the symbol of this Fear, of the human dread of concrete Death. In the end he remains in possession of the scene, begging Lazarus to forgive him for the certain forgetfulness which is to come. As Lazarus says pregnantly to the crowd, "Cæsar is your fear of man. Laugh away your Cæsars."

But there is nothing mocking in the laughter of Lazarus. It wells up from the depths of his heart and it fills every heart that hears him with joy. A few words will show the rhythmic beauty of the message:

Lazarus: Listen! In the dark peace of the grave the man called Lazarus rested. He was still weak, as one who recovers from a long illness—for living he had believed his life a sad one! (*He laughs softly and softly they all echo his laughter.*) He lay dreaming to the croon of silence, feeling as the flow of blood in his own veins the past reenter the heart of God to be renewed by faith into the future. He thought: "Men call this Death"—for he had been dead only a little while and he remembered. Then, of a sudden, a strange gay laughter trembled from his heart as though his life, so long repressed in him by fear, had found at last its voice and a song for singing. "Men call this Death," it sang. "Men call Life Death and fear it. They hide from it in horror! Their lives are spent in hiding! They love their lives in hiding! They live their loves in fearing! Their fear becomes their living! Their hate becomes their loving! They worship Life as Death!"

Chorus of Followers: (In a chanting echo)

Men call Life Death and fear it
They hide from it in horror
Their lives are spent in hiding
They love their lives in hiding
They live their loves in fearing

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Their fear becomes their living
Their hate becomes their loving
They worship Life as Death.

Lazarus: And here the song of Lazarus' song grew pitiful. "Men must learn to live," it mourned. "Before their fear invented Death, they knew, but now they have forgotten. They must be taught to laugh again!" And Lazarus answered "Yes." (*He now addresses the crowd—especially Caligula, directly, laughingly*) 'Thus sang his life to Lazarus while he lay dead! Man must learn to live by laughter! (*He laughs.*)

Chorus of Lazarus' Followers:

Ha-ah-ah-ah!
There is no Death!
There is only Life!
There is only laughter!
Ha-ah-ah-ah!

Lazarus Laughed is not only lofty poetry; it is also fine drama. The mass effects are cumulative in intensity, until the magnificent climax in the banquet hall of Tiberius, where Lazarus, the symbol of the Spirit, achieves the mastery over the supreme power of Earth. Only O'Neill could have conceived that scene, in which the dead body of Miriam, the wife of Lazarus, comes for a moment back to consciousness, to bear witness that beyond Death there is Life. Left alone by her death, he wins the intense sympathy that always goes out to the character who faces singly with the weapons of the Spirit, touched by divine sanction, the sordid strength of human power. It seems as though O'Neill had reached at this climax a height that would make of all that was to come an anticlimax, but the last Act rises still into loftier regions, amid the flames of the Roman amphitheatre. It is as though O'Neill had gathered all the longing of a sick world for hope and faith and love and shown through the ancient story the way to eternal peace.

A writer is not always the best exponent of his own artistic purpose, but in a letter recently sent to me, O'Neill reveals his general philosophy of composition so forcibly that it must be quoted:

in terms of transfigured modern values and symbols
~~that~~ in the theatre which may to some degree
bring home to members of a modern audience
them, identifying with the tragic figures on the
stage. Of course, this is very much of a dream
but where the theatre is concerned, one must
have a dream, and the Greek drama in
tragedy is the noblest ever!

All the above sounds a bit confused - it's
just scribbled off - but I know it will accomplish
its purpose of giving you some inkling of a bit
I'd say if we could talk - as we surely must -
sometime.

In the meantime, if your article can't wait
we might send me some question to be
answered.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely, Eugene O'Neill.

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

It's not in me to pose much as a "misunderstood one," but it does seem discouragingly (that is, if one lacked a sense of ironic humor!) evident to me that most of my critics don't want to see what I'm trying to do or how I'm trying to do it, although I flatter myself that end and means are characteristic, individual and positive enough not to be mistaken for anyone's else, or for those of any "modern" or "pre-modern" school. To be called a "sordid realist" one day, a "grim pessimistic Naturalist" the next, a "lying Moral Romanticist" the next, etc. is quite perplexing—not to add the *Times* editorial that settled *Desire* once and for all by calling it a "Neo-Primitive," a Matisse of the drama, as it were! So I'm really longing to explain and try and convince some sympathetic ear that I've tried to make myself a melting pot for all these methods, seeing some virtues for my ends in each of them, and thereby, if there is enough real fire in me, boil down to my own technique. But where I feel myself most neglected is just where I set most store by myself—as a bit of a poet, who has labored with the spoken word to evolve original rhythms of beauty where beauty apparently isn't—*Jones*, *Ape*, *God's Chillun*, *Desire*, etc.—and to see the transfiguring nobility of tragedy, in as near the Greek sense as one can grasp it, in seemingly the most ignoble, debased lives. And just here is where I am a most confirmed mystic, too, for I'm always, always trying to interpret Life in terms of lives, never just lives in terms of character. I'm always acutely conscious of the Force behind—(Fate, God, our biological past creating our present, whatever one calls it—Mystery certainly)—and of the one eternal tragedy of Man in his glorious, self-destructive struggle to make the Force express him instead of being, as an animal is, an infinitesimal incident in its expression. And my profound conviction is that this is the only subject worth writing about and that it is possible—or can be—to develop a tragic expression in terms of transfigured modern values and symbols in the theatre which may to some degree bring home to members of a modern audience their ennobling identity with the tragic figures on the stage. Of course, this is very much of a dream, but where the theatre is concerned, one must have a dream, and the Greek dream in tragedy is the noblest ever!

If Eugene O'Neill is primarily a poet, he is a playwright, too, but he is a great dramatist because he is more than a dramatist. His own most distinct successes in the theatre, like *Anna Christie*, interest him least, and while the theatre is in

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

his blood, he will be finally estimated not by his stage devices, like the four-roomed cottage in *Desire Under the Elms*, but by his profound imaginative interpretation of aspiring humanity, struggling upward, even through sin and shame, toward the light.

O'Neill's art is progressive, within itself and as part of our dramatic history. To those who view our national art through diminishing glasses, he seems a radical departure from all before him. But to one who views it in its steady development he was to be expected. Essentially drama is a celebration of the individual in conflict with something—Fate, circumstance, moral and social law,—which hampers or crushes him. We have seen how during the Twentieth Century, political and economic rights having been secured, the dramatists, under the leadership of William Vaughn Moody, became concerned with the problem of the individual's right to self-expression, and the sanctity of rebellion was taught, even, as in *The Masque of Judgment*, to the overthrow of God himself.

Eugene O'Neill certainly marks the next step forward. The individual no longer rebels against God or Fate for the right to express himself. He demands something more. The Creative Force as part of its responsibility for the creation of the individual, must express him. O'Neill thus indicates the essential dignity of his art. Whatever his characters may attempt, success or failure means little, but the struggle was worth while. Misguided, blundering, *The Hairy Ape* was struggling for his place in creation, and the final words of the play, "And, perhaps, the Hairy Ape at last belongs," are clear. Ephraim Cabot in *Desire* talks to God as a taskmaster in whose very "hardness" he rejoices. The New Englander of Cabot's type gloried in an adversary worthy of his steel.

But the representation of the Force of life is not always so concrete as in *Desire*. In *The Great God Brown* it manifests itself in at least four of the main characters: Dion Anthony, the painter who represents the creative spirit of art; William Brown, the successful man of today; Margaret, the normal

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

woman; Cybel, the prostitute, all representing the eternal creative instinct in different phases. For O'Neill with all his symbolism never fails to create live people, and probably three-fourths of the audience of *The Great God Brown* were held by the human struggle without seeing the symbolism at all. They saw the tragedy in the dying words of Dion and of Brown, both begging for the belief which the paganism of one and the materialism of the other had crushed out of their lives. And this is really all O'Neill expected them to see. He did not propose any solution of this eternal problem, as he proposed no solution for *Anna Christie* or *The Hairy Ape*. Back of the human lives he treats he sees a force so infinitely greater than any character that man cannot estimate it, but can only feel, dimly or ecstasically, the power he can but vaguely interpret.

Lazarus Laughed marks a new step in O'Neill's interpretation of man's origin and destiny. He has already progressed in this drama even beyond the conception of the relations of God and man which he reveals in the letter I have quoted. There is less emphasis upon the struggle of man for the expression of his personality by the Divine Force; there is more emphasis laid upon the peace which comes to man as a merciful and bountiful gift from Death. But dying is not the mere release from weariness; it is the return to a full communion with Eternal Life. It is no mere Nirvana: the individual will is preserved. While there is peace, it is not that of forgetfulness. The divine necessity of remembering is stressed always, and the great tragedy of man is that he does not remember what might keep him noble. Man longs to know what is beyond, but does not realize that if he could remember what came before, he would solve the eternal riddle. There it is—"the glory and the dream."

For O'Neill is a mystic. Generations of Celtic ancestry flower in him, just as generations of the Puritan mystic flowered in Hawthorne and Emerson. In him the Celtic nature, with its intimate relations with the past, catches a gleam now and then of the dim regions where God brought into being a

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

nobler form of life than had before existed. Because of this clutch of the primitive which the Celt as the oldest of the Indo-European races has guarded as its birthright, O'Neill goes down into the depths of human life to study apparently degraded forms. His audiences gasp often, comprehend sometimes, but always apprehend at least that a soul is speaking to them who has something important to say.

European and Asiatic audiences, even if they often mistake his meaning, recognize, too, in some instances better than his own countrymen, the universal note in his work. It is this lack of the parochial that has carried his plays into critical favor on the Continent, and it is to the credit of the European at least that so little attempt has been made to "derive" him from Scandinavian sources. For while O'Neill is acquainted with drama that has preceded him, the mysticism of the Celt is not the mysticism of the Teuton. With the exception of *Diff'rent* indeed, his long plays all have a lift, an exaltation which is the touchstone of true tragedy. The drama of pessimism is not his province, for the Celt hears, even with the fingers of fate at his throat, a cry in his ears too vibrant for the other races to hear. We have seen how in the last act of *The Straw* O'Neill dramatized the insistent hold of hope in the human breast even in the face of death.

It is this Celtic ancestry which leads him to symbolism. The race in its painting, its poetry, its religion, thinks in symbols, knowing that mysticism has to be tied down to reality by some concrete expression. The procession on Fifth Avenue in *The Hairy Ape* bothered a great many. It appeared to them to be out of the picture of realistic life on which the rest of the play seemed to be based. To O'Neill it was only an experiment, differing not in kind but in degree, for the entire play was a symbolic picture of the struggle upwards of physical strength toward a spiritual growth.

One of the most interesting characteristics of O'Neill's work lies in his refusal to be neatly classified. *Beyond the Horizon*, his first long play to be produced, and *The Great God Brown*

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

seem at first to be of a vastly different species. But in each, the hero, Robert Mayo or Dion Anthony, represents that protest of the artist against the limitations of ordinary life, and in each his marriage, while it satisfies one demand of his nature, sets one of those limits. Of course, like any true artist, O'Neill moves on. His first plays were written in the accepted mode. But what makes *Beyond the Horizon* still the best of his naturalistic plays is not only its sterling form, but also its flavor of the romance of aspiration.

He steadily declines to be limited in his theme or locality. His roots are in America, often in the New England where he has lived so long and which he understands so well. He can describe the decadent aristocracy of the small town in New England in *The First Man* as realistically as Mary Wilkins Freeman or Sarah Orne Jewett, but he is really not concerned with their limitations except as background. In *The Fountain* the elixir of eternal youth attracts him as a romantic theme, just as it attracted Hawthorne in *Doctor Grimshawe's Secret*; in *Marco Millions*, he took an old world wanderer for a hero; in *Lazarus Laughed* he passed beyond the gates of Death.

It is not only in his choice of such a theme as the water of eternal life that he resembles Hawthorne. In those striking passages in Emerson's *Journals* in which he describes Hawthorne's burial, the Concord philosopher tells us:

Clarke in the church said that Hawthorne had done more justice than any other to the shades of life, shown a sympathy with the crime in our nature, and like Jesus, was the friend of sinners.

Discussion raged at one time over the problem of the apparent contradiction between Hawthorne's retired life at Salem, Lenox or Concord and his deep knowledge of the effects of sin and even crime upon the consciences of his characters. No such problem occurs in the case of O'Neill. His wanderings in search of adventure and his experience as a reporter have both brought him into contact with the seamy side of human

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

nature. But the important point does not lie in a discussion of their material. The significant fact remains that twice at least during our literary history a poet has used the medium of prose to reveal the beauty that lies in the human soul, even though it has gone through the crucible of temptation and sin, to fuse away the dross of life. To Hawthorne, Hester Prynne and Donatello were finer clay than if adultery and murder had not stained them, because through suffering they won a character not theirs before. Anna Christie, purified from her sordid past by the cleansing power of the "old devil, sea," Dion Anthony, hiding his longing to create under the mask of the sensualist, are expressions of the same sympathy with sinners. To Hawthorne's serene certainty of form O'Neill has not attained. O'Neill is working in a different medium, and has not even yet learned to avoid certain uglinesses of detail which are most apparent in *Diff'rent*, *The Hairy Ape*, and *Desire Under the Elms*.

These defects, however, are the result of misguided power, never of weakness or carelessness. Like Hawthorne again, O'Neill ruthlessly destroys his work if it is not up to his standard. Nineteen of his plays, many of which were in one act, have been sent to oblivion. Here again the romantic stories about his manuscripts being accidentally lost in an old trunk down in Washington Square are a part of the myth that is persistently being built up around him. There were no manuscripts left by him to such a chance, but he deliberately destroyed his less artistic efforts to keep him, as he humorously says, "out of temptation."

For O'Neill takes his art, but not himself, quite seriously. The O'Neill myth amuses him, for the sincere personality back of his plays has nothing of the theatre in his appearance or general outlook. He works in his own way—that is his right. Like anyone who does important work, he is intense in his concentration, and while the letters incorporated in this chapter are written in a clear and readable script, the manuscript of his plays is characteristic of the absorption of the artist in his

EUGENE O'NEILL, POET AND MYSTIC

work. The script begins in a fairly normal hand, then as it progresses, the writing becomes smaller and more crowded, until, as the mood grows more intense, it becomes almost illegible to the normal eye. Like all poets and mystics, he sees before him the supreme goal; the distractions of life and the opinions of men are apparently of not much significance, although O'Neill is not in any real sense a recluse. He lives in his home in Connecticut, a convenient place of escape, for work of the kind he is doing needs the quiet in which concentrated effort alone is possible. But he assumes none of the airs of the mystic, for the part is not assumed. It is only one of the phases of O'Neill's work which lifts him out of the parochial and leads him to the universal atmosphere in which great art flowers.

One group of our playwrights may go on painting amusing pictures which the comic supplement throws upon the screen of American life. That our audiences should crowd the theatres where such plays are produced is easily understood. But it is encouraging that when an artist like Eugene O'Neill resolutely sets his face against the picturing of the merely little things of life he should have won the wide recognition he already enjoys. He paints little souls and big souls, but he never consciously gives us the unimportant or the mean. We may not like all of his characters—we may even shudder at them—like the Emperor Jones himself, but O'Neill found in that thief and murderer a spark that distinguished him from all the natives of that imaginary island. We agree with the epitaph of Smithers: "'E's a better man than the lot o' you put together."

O'Neill found that spark, of course, because he put it there. Even in the most degraded man, O'Neill recognizes the saving grace that comes from his divine origin. Nearly a century ago, Emerson called this universal brotherhood in us the creation of the Oversoul, the Life Force that animates everything, and founded on this conception his gospel of hope. O'Neill has dared to go further into the depths than Emerson or Hawthorne, for the Puritan had reactions of conservatism from

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

which the Celt is free. But it is a pitiful stupidity of criticism that sees only the repellent in *All God's Chillun Got Wings* or *Desire Under the Elms*. I confess frankly that on reading the first I could see little beauty in it, but in the theatre I recognized again the vision of the poet who saw more deeply than I. I felt, too, my academic objections to soliloquy on the stage go by the board, when I recognized that to these characters soliloquy was natural. But I have become accustomed to seeing theatrical rules broken with success by O'Neill because he practically never breaks dramatic laws. It is a great thing for art when academic definitions are shattered by creative genius, and it is to be hoped he will go on shattering them. For he has become the concrete expression of the greatest principle in art, that of freedom, freedom to choose one's subject anywhere, to treat it in any manner, provided always that the characters are great figures and the treatment is sincere.

It is, fortunately, too soon to pass any final judgment upon Eugene O'Neill, but it is high time to arrive at some perspective concerning him. For he is, I think, passing through a phase of his development. His material has always been romantic, whether it be chosen from the slums of New York or Xanadu in the Thirteenth Century. But he began with a treatment which is essentially realistic and in *Beyond the Horizon* he proved that there is no antithesis between romantic material and realistic treatment, but that the latter corrects and adjusts the imaginative processes of the first. With *The Hairy Ape* he passed into a stage of symbolic treatment which may have reached its height in *The Great God Brown* and *Lazarus Laughed*. The danger here lies in the fact that romance and symbolism mix too easily, and the result may become confusion. But no matter what new phase in his development may come, there will be apparent still the poet, brooding and creating, and the mystic, letting speak through him the Creative Force that lifts humanity from the beast that passes to the man who eternally aspires.

CHAPTER XXII

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

IT WOULD be a mistake to attribute to the Great War any of the changes which came in the drama about the beginning of the third decade of the new century. It is too early even to characterize those changes with finality and to ascertain their causes would naturally be more difficult. Yet the alterations in the standards of living and in moral and social judgments which came as a consequence of the disturbed mind of the world have been reflected in our drama. We suffered less change than Europe and our drama reflects in consequence less change. In life itself the chief results seem to be a natural reaction against the unity of purpose which war brings with it. There has come in consequence a confusion of standards, and on the part of the younger generation a scrutiny, pitiless in its rejection of authority and pitiful in its brave show of self-confidence, of institutions and laws, of manners and morals, in an effort to establish its own standards of life.

This searching scrutiny has resulted in drama in an examination of the institution of marriage, into the relations of parents and children, and the relations of the individual to society. These are of course no new themes; the novelty has come in the method of approach. There has too often been a mere sharpening of the tone and tempo, as in the melodrama, an underlining of the verbal expression, which is always a confession of weakness, for meaning and expression should be forcible enough to underline themselves.

Drama, of course, follows, not precedes, the progress of life. Conflicts, which are the life of drama, have often been in process

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

of settlement, while the tone of the plays which record these conflicts has still seemed daring. This is sometimes because human beings decline to recognize a social or moral change until long after it has occurred, and sometimes because the change has after all not been so fundamental as it at first appeared. Notwithstanding all the assaults upon marriage, for example, the institution will probably continue and if two people love each other and have children it will probably be happy—otherwise not. Attacks upon social or moral conventions seem more daring on the stage than they do in the novel, partly because in the theatre we feel compelled to observe with the traditions and standards of the herd, while in reading the novel, we judge entirely by our own standards.

The most significant tendency in the American drama since 1920 has been the attempt to deal sincerely with character. This realism of treatment may have arisen from the searching scrutiny of all human institutions to which allusion has already been made. But as yet generalizations are a bit dangerous. We have seen that the type play and the melodrama have not changed materially. The play of social life has progressed, but it is in the field of what is called for lack of a better name, domestic drama, that the most definite advance has been made. By domestic drama I mean the play that grows out of complications and conflicts among closely related people, drawn usually from a group not distinguished by acute social consciousness, but more concerned with the personal aspects of the struggle.

Two playwrights, both novelists, carry over into the third decade the drama of revolt, and link the impulse inspired directly by Moody to a newer technique. Zona Gale (1874-) won the Pulitzer Prize in 1921 with her dramatization of *Miss Lulu Bett*. Miss Lulu Bett, both in the story and the play, is the typical unmarried woman without a career beyond that of helping her married sister and enduring her brother-in-law's teasing. Her rebellion and her flight with her lover, who has concealed his earlier marriage in the belief that his wife is

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

dead, give an opportunity for Lulu Bett to develop her character through her return to face the emptiness of her life and the taunts of her family. In the version first played, she departs to fight her battle alone, though with a new offer of marriage, one might say, on file. This ending was changed, to bring the first lover back, unmarried, and Miss Gale has published two third Acts, in the printed play, for her justification, or protest. Neither version is very impressive, but she has secured the humor which springs from a clever reproduction of dullness.

In *Mr. Pitt* (1924) Miss Gale made an attempt, not altogether successful, in the drama of futility. In adapting her novel of *Birth* for the stage she sharpened the lines of conduct materially, and made Mr. Pitt, the paper hanger, who longs to be something better and finer, a sympathetic character, well acted by Walter Huston, especially in the climax of the second Act, when he promises himself that he will break through the tangle of his life. The recognition of his inherent nobility by Rachel Arrowsmith, the gentlewoman, while his wife with her hopeless meanness of character never understands him, was also better expressed on the stage than in the novel.

Of more significance in the theatre, Susan Glaspell (1882-) and her husband, George Cram Cook, were perhaps the two driving forces in the inception of the Provincetown Players. Her *Suppressed Desires*, a one-act play which formed one of the two offerings on the first bill of that group, in the summer of 1915, is a delightful satire on the cult of self-expression. Through the trying period of establishment, her one-act plays formed with the work of O'Neill the most significant source of supply to the Provincetown Players. Among these the best perhaps is *Trifles*, a tense little scene in a farmhouse after the death of a man and the arrest of his wife on suspicion. Two women neighbors destroy the evidence which pointed to a motive, while the sheriff and county attorney are examining the premises. It is distinctly dramatic, and the effect of the personality of the absent wife is suggested by deft touches.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

This representation of an absent woman through the conversation of others, may have led to the writing of Miss Glasspell's three-act play, *Bernice* (1919). While there is too much talk for the amount of action, nevertheless there is real power in the conception. The characters are the husband, the father, the best friend, and the servant of Bernice, with a note of contrast in her sister-in-law. Bernice has affected them all vitally and she has died suddenly, while her husband was away. He has been unfaithful to her and has not returned promptly to his home on his return from Europe. The character that impresses one most is that of Abbie, the servant who has been with Bernice since her birth. She never steps out of her place as a servant; she is laconic and tries to keep away from them all. This makes all the more striking her first revelation to Craig Norris, Bernice's husband, that Bernice had killed herself. The effect on Craig is to plunge him into remorse, yet he feels also a strange kind of joy, for it proves to him that Bernice loved him more deeply than he had ever suspected, and the veil that had separated him from her seems to have been lifted. He tells the secret to Margaret, her friend, alone and there is much talk between them concerning his trifling with life, which prepares the way, however, for Abbie's second revelation to Margaret that Bernice had not killed herself but had made Abbie promise to tell her husband that she had done so. Margaret is thrown into a terrible situation; she longs to tell Craig and yet when she sees that the lie has begun to work great changes for the better in him, that he feels that he must begin to be worthy of the love of the woman who had gone to her death because of her passion for him, she hesitates to enlighten him. And then she realizes that Bernice had sent this message to save him from the littleness of his life, knowing that only such a shock could work the miracle. *Bernice* is a play that lives in one's memory. It is too long drawn out but time is necessary for the character changes in Craig Norris, and Abbie's disclosures could not have been made except at intervals, granted her inarticulate guarded nature, shot

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

through with devotion to her mistress. Abbie was played by Susan Glaspell at the Provincetown production.

In *The Inheritors* (1921) she produced another important play. It is a study of the way in which the liberals of one generation become the conservatives of the next. The theme had been treated by Bennett and Knoblock in *Milestones*, but Miss Glaspell gave to her play a distinctly American setting. Silas Morton, a pioneer in the Middle West, which Miss Glaspell knows well, founds in 1879 a college to carry on his liberal views, encouraged by his friend, Felix Fejevary, an exile from Hungary on account of his radical opinions. By 1920, the son of Count Fejevary has become intrenched in the responsibility and the conservatism of the Board of Trustees but the third generation of Mortons, represented by the granddaughter, has become definitely radical. One of the best touches is the attitude of the college professor, who is partly a sincere radical and partly anxious for martyrdom. The trouble with *The Inheritors* is its special pleading. It has held the stage, however, in this country and in England, and it represents Miss Glaspell's unquenchable love for freedom of speech.

Those who saw *The Verge*, as given by the Provincetown Players in 1921, witnessed an extraordinary play. It is a study of a neurotic woman who is going insane. She has a great desire to create new forms of life and is planting new flowers and developing new species. She is also experimenting with human souls in the shape of two men, friends of hers who are staying in the house. In the last act she kills one of these as a gift to him. Then she fires off a pistol and sings "Nearer, My God, to Thee" as the curtain goes down. Margaret Wycherly played the part of Claire in a very masterly way. She showed the gradual increase in violence of the symptoms of a woman in that condition, but the question remains, is the whole thing worth while? If there is one coherent idea in the play it is that only through violent suffering and wreckage of lives can any growth be attained. As this does not happen to be true the play fails by the test of verity. After all, Susan Glaspell

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

and Zona Gale, keen as their love for the theatre may be, are more experimental than systematic in their work for it. This is shown clearly when we contrast their achievement with the plays of an expert craftsman, who devotes his entire attention to the theatre.

Among the new domestic dramas of character, *The Hero* (1921) by Gilbert Emery, is a model. The author, whose brilliant social comedy, *Episode*, has already been discussed, was born in Naples, New York, of New England ancestry. An Amherst graduate, he came into the theatre after writing short stories and verse, and after experiences of continental life both before and during the Great War, in which he held a commission as First Lieutenant. He has gained a thorough knowledge of the stage through his professional experience as an actor since his return from military service and *The Hero* is remarkable not only on account of its fidelity to the life of a small town, which Emery knows well, but also from its compact structure and its cumulative effect.

It is a study of the contrasted natures of two brothers, Andrew and Oswald Lane, and of their relations with Hester, Andrew's wife. Oswald has gone to France, leaving behind him a burden of broken pledges and of financial dishonesty, which Andrew has quietly assumed. When Oswald returns after the war, Emery shows skilfully how the prodigal hero, with a war cross, and a personal charm, fascinates his sister-in-law, and wins the passionate love of Marthe, a young Belgian refugee, who is living in Andrew's home. The war has changed Oswald little; he takes, whenever he can, what life gives him, and he has no sense of moral obligation. The one spark of good in him seems to be his response to the adoration of his little nephew, whom he teaches to build a camp fire and otherwise entertains. But he shows no disposition to take up any business and when Andrew hints, expostulates and finally explains clearly how limited his own resources are, the feminine psychology which turns his mother and wife against him for daring to deal harshly with a hero like Oswald is depicted with



Photocopy, Mrs. L. Hill, Studio

Yours Sincerely
Gilbert Emery

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

the vividness of an etching. Oswald has his own standards, it is true, and when Hester shows him that she will be his for the asking, he implicitly declines her offer in a masterly scene, in which his cynical indifference to any interest but his own makes him brutal in his casual remark—"Hess—lemme give you a tip. You stick to your kid—he's hero enough for you." He gets her out of the room in order that he may steal the treasury of the church, for which Andrew is responsible, and thereby return to France to "his own kind of girl." Hester returns with a blanket for him and sees him take the money. Marthe, the Belgian girl, sees Hester in her turn and the curtain of the second Act comes down on a strong situation, in which only one word is spoken.

What made *The Hero* noteworthy in the theatre was its close hold on the principle of suspense. The third Act keeps one tense with a sense of brooding disaster, but the playwright has not, as is usual in domestic drama, given away his supreme moment in advance. When it comes it is woven out of the characters, prepared for carefully, but expressed swiftly and inevitably. Andrew returns in the morning upon a scene in which Hester is fighting to keep Oswald from leaving with the money. He defies her to stop him, threatening to expose her, and brutally leaving her Marthe as a legacy. Then when we seem to see the wrecks of a play before us, Emery lifts them into a climax. The fire bell rings as Andrew comes in and Hester and he rush out, fearing for the little boy, for Marthe has come in from her fruitless pursuit of Oswald with the one word "Kindergarten" on her lips. In a moment they re-enter with little Andy wrapped in Oswald's coat. The tragedy is unfolded in perfect simplicity:

Little Andy: I ain't hurted, mummy—not a bit. Uncle Oswal' come and got me. He found me. The fire got ev'rywhere, and Uncle Oswal' come. Where's Uncle Oswal'?

Hester: (*To her husband*) Tell me.

Andrew: He's gone.

Hester: Tell me.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Andrew: I don' know. The kindergarten. Andy lit a camp fire, he says, and it was all afire in no time, they say. Andy was missing and Oswald run in and got him. And then Oswald run back again, after another little boy, that's what they say—and the roof fell in on 'em. Oh, God—it's awful! Burned to death! That's his overcoat there on baby. And he's gone. And I was here a-talking and making jokes. It's awful.

Hester: (*A look of awe on her face*) Oh, Oswald could do that! Oh, thank God!

Then with our knowledge of Oswald's utter selfishness, we listen to Andrew's regret for the hard words he had used to him. Hester lies bravely with an improvised message of good-by from Oswald to his brother and then the play proceeds to its close:

Hester: Andrew, that money—the collection—the money you—
Andrew: Yes?

Hester: I gave it—to Oswald—to put it in the bank.

Andrew: Now? This morning?

Hester: Just now.

Andrew: (*Slowly, scarcely comprehending*) Then it's gone. It's burned. With him.

Hester: He took it—to put it in the bank.

Andrew: (*Sighing heavily, then squaring himself to meet the blow*) Then we'll have to make it up. That's all. We'll have to make it up—

Hester: Yes. We'll have to pay it. Oh, Andy, if you knew . . .

Andrew: 'Tain't your fault, Hester. Don't you worry. Natural enough for you to give it to him to put in the bank for you. Don't fret, honey, 'bout that.

Hester: Oh, Andy,—Andy! Why didn't I understand?

Andrew: Sh!— It's all right. Seems sometimes as though everything hits you all in a heap. . . . We'll get out of it somehow. . . . I'm so darn sorry for you, Hess. I know how you miss all the nice things that other girls have—

Hester: Andrew! Don't!

Andrew: Well, it's true—an' I don't blame you. Maybe I can borrow a little money somewhere. . . . Yes. It's tough, but it's got to be done.

Hester: I don't mind, Andrew. I'll help you. Oh, Andy—I'm so—so sorry.

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

Andrew: Why, of course. There doesn't anything matter much, dear, so long as I got you and the boy. Thank God for that!— Now I must go an' find ma. Poor ma! And then— go back there to—him—

Hester: (*Looking into his eyes with a new love born of her suffering and shame*) You are a good man, Andrew! Now I know! A good, good man.

Andrew: (*Humbly and simply taking her into his arms*) Me? I'm just old Andy, I am. But Os—Os was a hero.

The quotations cannot do justice to the art with which Emery drew three of the most living characters in modern drama. His vivid contrasts between the moral and physical hero, not types but real people, was rewarded by critical acclaim, but the keen analysis of the psychology of the returned soldier came perhaps too early for popular success. To his eternal credit, he refused to accede to managerial requests that he modify the ending by bringing Oswald back to marry Marthe, preferring to let the play pass from the stage into dramatic literature.

While *The Hero* had only a moderate run, *Tarnish*, (1923) Emery's next play, was a popular success. Though probably not on the whole as significant as *The Hero*, it is a worthy companion to it, for it is based on the universal motive of the triumph of love over circumstances, over doubt, and over human weakness. The central character is that of Letitia Tevis, a young girl whose strong yet delicate personality is set against a background of a complaining mother, a dissolute father, and a lover, Emmet Carr, whose past rises concretely in the person of Nettie Dark, the manicure girl, the active cause of what might have been a tragedy. Emery, of course, did not force a happy ending, but the stage directions of the printed version are an implicit defense of his final scene. Tishy has said good-by to Carr because she finds out that he, like all the rest, is tarnished. Then Mrs. Healey, the Irish charwoman, finds her in tears and comforts her.

Mrs. Healey: There's a lad on the stairs out there. . . . I don't know what you said to him, but if you love him, keep him, for

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

there's nothing worth the keeping in this world but love—My God, they're a poor lot, the men, all of 'em, and dirty, too—but the thing is, darlin', to get one that cleans easy.

The stage directions explain that Tishy forgives him because of her love for him which will not let him go. No one who saw the performance of Ann Harding can need any explanations. In this, her first part of importance, she won a place for herself as an actress of distinction. The entire cast, in fact, illustrated the high level of the acting of today. But, after all, Emery provided them with a play based on the old unities of time, of place, and of action, portraying a life that is familiar to thousands of the inhabitants of New York City by means of a conversation that preserved the necessary compromise between the language of literature and that which is actually spoken by human beings. The play is a comedy in the sense that Balzac wrote comedy, but it rises above the usual stage comedy because the material is not made sport of, it is treated seriously. The sympathy of the audience goes out completely to the high-hearted woman of twenty-three, who squares herself to meet the blows of circumstance, quietly and with dignity, and, to the onlooker, with infinite pathos. But it is not only that Letitia Tevis exists—the important thing is that she exists only in America.

While Arthur Richman (1886-) has written an attractive romance in *Not So Long Ago*, and a popular social comedy, *The Awful Truth*, his claim to consideration rests upon a powerful domestic drama, *Ambush* (1921). The theme of the play is put very forcibly by Mrs. Jennison, who tells Walter Nichols, the central character, how the circumstances of life lie in ambush to prevent him from living the upright, decent life he desires. *Ambush* is laid in the home of a clerk of moderate means, whose daughter brings him to shame through her reckless love of pleasure and whose wife's tacit support of her daughter's conduct leaves him helpless to meet the situation. *Ambush* was terrible in its fidelity to the sordid side of life, was well constructed and written with sincerity.

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

Richman has done nothing since that equals it in power. There was promise in the opening of *A Serpent's Tooth* (1922) but the play went to pieces in the last Act. To one auditor, it seemed as though some violence had been done to the original conception out of regard for the box office.

One of the most encouraging signs of the new spirit in the drama was the reform of Owen Davis (1874-), who having written over one hundred melodramas of a negligible quality, was prompted partly by the achievements of other native playwrights and partly by a study of Ibsen to write more sincere drama. Davis had graduated from Harvard in 1893 and having met with no response in his efforts to write tragedy in verse, turned his attention to playwriting as a business. In 1921 he wrote *The Detour* in which he tried to depict character rather than mere types, and while the play did not succeed financially, it was recognized by the discriminating as being among the best of the season's products. The theme of *The Detour* is the eternal quality of hope. Helen Hardy is the wife of a farmer on Long Island. Years before she had given up her dream of a career to marry her husband, who is land hungry, and she determines that her daughter Kate shall not make the same mistake. They have saved money enough to send Kate to an art school in New York, and then Steve, her father, demands that she give him the money to buy a lot which belongs to Tom Lane, Kate's lover. Helen defies her husband and decides to go to New York with Kate. This situation is developed by means of comedy and the dialogue is bright and direct. Helen's character is painted in these few words:

"I get so tired of sayin' nothin' but just exactly what's so and listenin' to folks that don't ever mean the least mite more'n they say, or the least mite less!"

A scene which reveals Davis's insight occurs when Steve Hardy and Lamont, a painter, are looking at Kate's work, not knowing that she overhears them:

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Steve: I guess no man knows less about art, and such as that, than I do, but it happened to be a bit of land around here she painted, and I know land.

Dana: Your opinion should be of as much value then as my own—what do you think of this yourself?

Steve: Somehow it seems to me it don't look like it ought—not just like—I don't know—it's Tom Lane's twenty acres all right—but it don't look just like it was alive somehow, does it?

Dana: No.

Steve: It's grass but it ain't growing grass; there's the spring wheat, but you can't somehow think of its ever ripening—like wheat does.

Dana: No.

It is in such quiet moments as this that the course of a life is changed. But in Kate's case it is not a tragedy; she has been driven on more by her mother's desire than her own ambition. She settles down with Tom contentedly while Helen starts saving again for the grand-child who may come some day. Even her husband's ridicule does not daunt her, for as the curtain falls, "She is standing, her face glorified, looking out into the future, her heart swelling with eternal hope." Her husband has his land, her daughter and Tom have their love; she has saved her power of dreaming.

Davis was discouraged by the reception of *The Detour*, but decided that before he returned to the kind of play he could market, he would write "one more good play." In consequence, he undertook a study of the New England character, not the conventional type, but the hard inarticulate survivals of long struggle with the soil. Davis, who is descended from "generations of Northern Maine, small-town folk" to quote from his introduction to *Ice Bound* (1923), knows his people well. There is a certain similarity in the first Act of *Ice Bound* to the first Act of *The First Man*, in the tribal conclave, but it may be because both O'Neill and Davis know their people so well. The Jordans, all waiting for their mother to die, turn on Jane, the young cousin, who has tended their mother, and then on Ben, the youngest and the prodigal. But they fawn

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

on Jane when they find she is left the property and she forces Ben to work for her, for he is under indictment for arson and has no option. Her reason for trying to reform him is revealed in a masterly scene in which Jane reads to Judge Bradford, who loves her, the letter Mrs. Jordan had left for her:

Jane: "My dear Jane, the doctor tells me I haven't long to live, and so I'm doing this, the meanest thing I think I've ever done to you. I'm leaving you the Jordan money. Since my husband died there has been just one person I could get to care about, that's Ben, who was my baby so long after all the others had forgotten how to love me. And Ben's a bad son, and a bad man. I can't leave him the money; he'd squander it, and the Jordans' money came hard."

Judge: Poor woman! It was a bitter thing for her to have to write like that.

Jane: "If squandering the money would bring him happiness, I'd face all the Jordans in the other world and laugh at them, but I know there's only just one chance to save my boy—through a woman who will hold out her heart to him and let him trample on it as he has on mine."

Judge: (in sudden fear) Jane!

Jane: "Who'd work, and pray, and live for him, until as age comes on and maybe he gets a little tired, he'll turn to her. And you're that woman, Jane! You've loved him ever since you came to us. Although he doesn't even know it. The Jordan name is his, the money's yours, and maybe there'll be another life for you to guard. God knows it isn't much I'm leaving you, but you can't refuse it, because you love him, and when he knows the money's yours he will want to marry you. I'm a wicked old woman. Maybe you'll learn to forgive me as time goes on—it takes a long time to make a Jordan."

There is little reformation of Ben; Jane marries him under no illusions as to her permanent happiness, but simply because she loves him. After all, no one ever loves anyone else for a reason!

Davis was rewarded for his reformation by the Pulitzer Prize, which was awarded to *Ice Bound*. It can hardly be said with justice that his work since then has come up to that level.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

He has written clever farces like *The Nervous Wreck*, murder mystery plays and a more ambitious attempt at a character study in *Gentle Grafters* (1926), a story of the girl who attempts to skirt the edge of danger, which a weak third Act disfigured. The desire of Davis to write drama that is worth while can hardly be questioned, but his very prolific habits are a handicap.

The progress from the type play to the character study is illustrated by the work of an interesting partnership in the drama. George S. Kaufman (1889-) and Marcus Cook Connelly (1890-), both born in Western Pennsylvania and both newspaper men, first attracted attention by their clever comedy *Dulcy* (1921). It was natural that they should dramatize the material of the newspaper and they selected a character created by Franklin P. Adams, then a columnist for the New York *Tribune*. *Dulcy* celebrated the stupid, well-meaning married woman, who almost wrecks her husband's prospects by her plans and revelations during the week-end party which has been given to secure them. The two playwrights recognized that dullness can be made entertaining, if it is constantly contrasted with cleverness, so they provided one of the best character parts in her young brother, and they aroused, in an inimitable scene, a responsive chord in all who have suffered from the recital of the plot of a moving picture.

To the Ladies (1922) is an improvement upon *Dulcy* because the types are less eccentric and the characters of Leonard and Elsie Beebe achieve reality. Elsie is the opposite of Dulcy; she is the guiding spirit of the household, saving her husband from the consequences of his stupidity or conceit and not only preserving his own self-respect, but also fighting hard for her own belief in him. Kaufman and Connelly recognized the truth that the most precious asset in our lives consists in our illusions, and Elsie Beebe won the hearts of her audiences and kept them. Her brave little speech at the end of the first Act when she talks to Mr. Kincaid, Leonard's employer, through Mrs. Kincaid, because she sees that Leonard has lost his chance

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

to be invited to the great annual banquet of the Kincaid Piano Company, is her first high moment. Kincaid, who is a delightful picture of the self-important business man, has been deeply hurt by discovering that Leonard had borrowed money on his Kincaid Piano. He is about to leave, remarking that there is no reason why Elsie should explain the matter to him when she cries:

Oh, but there is! If I—if I could only make you understand! But, of course, you've never been poor—either of you—I mean—really poor—so that a few dollars actually mattered, and you had to be awful careful what you did with them. So that you had to plan weeks ahead . . . so much for each little thing, and if something came up that you hadn't counted on, and that just *had* to be paid, why, it meant doing without something that you—almost had to have to live. But you see—we've—done that—ever since we're married. And then, when it looks as though you've almost helped each other out of it—and the chance comes—oh, if I could only make you understand . . .

The play was praised highly for its satiric portrayal of the "public banquet," and it was amusing, but the climax was one in which character is wrought out of situation. Leonard has copied his speech out of a manual of speech making and is horrified to hear his rival, who is called just ahead of him, make the very same speech. He is paralyzed with stage fright and then Elsie rises—tells the table that he has suddenly been taken with laryngitis but that he has given her his notes and she will try to make his speech. He plays up to her and she gives them a human talk, skilfully touching Kincaid's weakness for approval, and makes the success of the evening. But what swept the audience was not only Helen Hayes' remarkable performance as Elsie; it was the quick response to the appeal of the young wife whose love had given her the inspiration that was to save them both. The light touch in *To the Ladies* concealed from many the really profound observation of life which gave birth to her, and the imagination that made her live. She has discovered that the wife who never lets her

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

husband be discounted by the world achieves a glory for herself that is one of the actualities, and this study of young married life, treated with understanding, with sympathy and with reticence is worth many a bitter analysis of exceptional unhappiness. The authors placed in Elsie's mouth as many bright sayings as they had put stupid ones in *Dulcy*. Her words to Kincaid in the last Act—"Nearly every man that ever got any place, Mr. Kincaid, has been married, and that couldn't be just a coincidence"—are a contribution to philosophy.

Merton of the Movies (1922) is a dramatization of the story by Harry Leon Wilson and it would be difficult to assign the relative shares to the credit of the novelist, the playwrights and the actor, Glenn Hunter, in the delightful presentation on the stage. The figure of the movie-struck clerk whose sole value turns out to be his unconscious burlesque of the part he is trying to play sincerely, was certainly made to live. It was a popular success, but *The Deep Tangled Wildwood* (1923), a clever satire "upon the Winchell-Smith type of play" was a failure.

The capacity of the co-authors for satire was revealed, however, in a delightful dream play, *Beggar on Horseback* (1924). The idea of a play in which satire upon existing conditions is expressed in terms of dreams is not new, of course, but the immediate suggestion was made by Winthrop Ames, who derived the idea from reading *Hans Sonnenstössers Höllenfahrt* by Paul Apel. In order that the flavor of the satire should be native, the playwrights did not read the original German play¹ so any discussion of its effect is unnecessary. Indeed, one familiar with the work of Kaufman and Connelly hardly needs to be assured of their originality, for through all the vision of the musician, Neil McRae, who sees his future if he marries into the rich family of the Cadys, their unmistakable blend of humor steadily shines. In this dream, Mr. Cady, who manufactures "widgets," takes Neil into the business and Neil is

¹ Statement to the writer by Mr. Connelly.

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

tossed from one stenographer to another in the vain search for a pencil, in the clutches of the modern efficiency system that makes more impediments to progress by separating the individual from his job than the old decentralized business ever conceived. Even better is the scene of the four prison cells in which are working the greatest living novelist, poet, painter, and composer, the last being Neil himself. When the novelist stops a moment in his dictation the stenographer goes right on for he is dictating from his own last book! Neil is condemned to composing music for lines like

You've broken my heart like you broke my heart
So why should you break it again?

Then comes the most memorable line in the play. Neil in desperation tugs at his cell door and finds that it opens easily.

"Why," he exclaims, "it was never locked!"

The dream is remarkably like a real dream; it has the peculiar assertion of verity, combined with the uncanny revelation of self-scrutiny and of the observation of others that is the experience of competent dreamers. The play is a fine expression of the resentment of the artist, the man who can do things that no one else can do, for the attitude of the Cadys and their like, whose ambition is to do everything just like other people and who are contemptuous of those who show originality. The title is a clever use of the phrase recorded by Robert Greene in his *Card of Fancie* in 1588: "Set a beggar on horseback, they say, and he will never alight."

Beggar on Horseback is the last collaboration, so far, of Kaufman and Connelly. There was no difference, but it was felt by both that it would be well for them to write separately for a time. The result has hardly been fortunate for the drama. Kaufman has written since then one original play, *The Butter and Egg Man* (1925). This is a clever farce, dealing with theatrical life, but while it was a financial success, it is hardly significant. It is in fact, a backward step, for it is a farce made up of hard caricature types, and depends en-

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

tirely upon its situations. *Minick* (1924), which he wrote in collaboration with Edna Ferber, is a dramatization of the latter's short story, *Old Man Minick*. The collaborators have published in one volume the short story and the play, together with an amusing account of the way in which the dramatization was made. *Minick*, however, is not important. It is the product of careful observation of life, which runs, however, to caricature, and there is little charm in it, however much amusement it provided on the stage. *The Good Fellow* (1926) was also a collaboration and was a failure.

Connelly has written one original play alone, *The Wisdom Tooth* (1926). It is a charming comedy, with a note of fantasy. Bemis is just the average senior clerk. He has had ambitions when he was a boy, but they have been submerged by the hard knocks of the city and an inferiority complex. In his boarding house, Sally Field sees the spark in him and tries to bring it out. He sees also in a dream the boy he used to be and he is visited by his grand-parents, a delightfully conceived pair. Under their influence he braves his employer, to protest against injustice, and the way in which the boy of his visions goes with him concretely is very appealing. Of course even this interview turns out to be a dream and when he does call up his employer, he is promptly discharged. But he has Sally's appreciation and the consciousness of his own self-respect.

The Wisdom Tooth is of great interest, for it seems to settle the question as to which member of the original partnership contributed the imaginative quality that lifted *To the Ladies* and *Beggar on Horseback* into permanent value. There is hardly a spark of it in Kaufman's work done alone or in collaboration with others. And yet of the three other elements which made the success of the plays written together, he certainly contributed his share to the compact structure, the brilliant dialogue and the keen satire. Neither has written alone as fine a play as *To the Ladies* and it is to be hoped that they will once more bring together the nimble wit and the vivid

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

fancy that made the union an unusual one in American play writing.

A playwright who has come definitely out of the theatre, George Kelly (1887-), made his début in juvenile parts in 1912, and his earlier work consisted of one-act plays, written for vaudeville. *Finders-Keepers* was the first of these; all of them have been acted with success. Probably the best are *The Flattering Word* and the first draft of *The Show-Off*. *The Flattering Word* portrayed, with keen satire, the conscious or subconscious belief in everyone's heart that he is a good actor, and the curiosity concerning the stage which possesses even those who denounce it.

Kelly's first long play to be produced, *The Torch-Bearers* (1922), is a delightful satire on the absurdities of those who use the Little Theatre as a social playground. It is laid in Philadelphia, where Kelly lives, and those who are acquainted with the intricacies, artistic and social, of amateur and semi-professional ventures in that city, experienced an especial delight in its revelation of human vanity. The best character was Mrs. J. Duro Pampinelli, the professional exploiter of amateur theatricals, drawn from actual life, but universal enough to make an appeal anywhere. *The Torch-Bearers*, however, while the first two acts were brilliant, led to no real climax and is of interest now mainly as marking Kelly's transition from the one-act play to something more significant. It is a drama, too, of types rather than real characters, except in one or two cases. *The Show-Off* (1924) marked one step forward. It was built up from a one-act play which was already a success on the vaudeville stage when *The Torch-Bearers* was first produced. Kelly's skill was shown clearly to those who saw the play in its earlier and later forms. While the flavor of vaudeville still remains in the speeches that are obviously planted for the retort, there is no apparent padding in the structure; the character of Aubrey Piper was built up until he occupies the center of interest throughout a most amusing "transcript of life"—to quote from the program. The

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

scene is North Philadelphia; the family into which Aubrey Piper marries is painted with unerring accuracy, especially the mother, who sees through him and beyond, and whose indignation at his boasting becomes all the more loquacious because it really remains helplessly inarticulate. The ending is weak; that any corporation would allow such a being as Aubrey to extort twice the royalty they had already agreed to give his young brother-in-law for his invention is incredible. But through the verity of its character drawing, this play has in it a human quality that redeems its plot. It is called a comedy, but it was partly the subconscious tragedy of the ever reaching for the unattainable which secured the slowly gathering sympathy of the audience for the boaster. Kelly recognized that one can allow all the other characters on the stage to make fun of the hero, but if the heroine and the audience are with him, the play succeeds.

Craig's Wife (1925) marked another step in Kelly's progress. *The Show-Off* was the product of acute observation; *Craig's Wife* is observation fused by imagination. The types have been still further rounded into characters, and there is a deeper philosophy of life. Mrs. Craig is a powerful study of the woman who attempts to dominate her entire household, including her husband. Her desire is for authority and through authority, security. Her god is her house, which must be spotless although the heavens fall. For a time she succeeds in excluding any interest that threatens her supremacy, but she is foiled partly by her husband's aunt and partly by her own selfishness in allowing her husband to incur the danger of an accusation of murder rather than betray her own morbid curiosity. One by one, the inmates of her home leave her, and the curtain descends upon her, left with her cherished possessions, to the emptiness of her future life. In a sense, it is the dramatization of the logical result of the feminine urge for domination, of whose opening wave *The Doll's House* was one of the heralds. If Nora leaves her home, a



George Kelly

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

rebel, so do Mrs. Craig's subjects leave her. *Craig's Wife* was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1926.

The art which created *Craig's Wife* faltered a bit in *Daisy Mayme* (1926). The characters are true to life, and the two sisters who neglect Cliff Mettinger for months and arrive together when he is to return from Atlantic City with his niece, May, whose mother has recently died, are uncannily alive. But the central character, Daisy Mayme Plunkett, who accompanies Cliff and May for a visit, who senses the situation and routs one sister, converts the other into an ally and finally marries Cliff, was too blatant and breezy in the actual production quite to fit into the picture. After all, the rest of the characters, who live in a house a hundred years old, which is furnished with taste, are not barbarians if they are distinctly not smart. Just why Daisy Mayme could not have been made more effective by being somewhat subdued is a question that a little disturbs the admirer of Kelly's work. It seems as though the desire to raise a laugh, by broad strokes, has conquered the finer art which showed in *Craig's Wife*. Yet on reading the play the wistful longing on Daisy's part for a bit of romance which the matter-of-fact proposal of Cliff denies her, indicates that perhaps the actress may have been responsible for a lack of charm that the text at least permitted. But since Kelly directs his own plays, even that way out is problematical; and he might indeed reply that if Daisy Mayme were a gentlewoman, she would not be in the house at all! There was certainly no part which provided the opportunity of which Chrystal Herne took such splendid advantage in *Craig's Wife*. Kelly has still to learn that observation is not enough. But with the craftsmanship that is already his, with the apparent mastery of the devices of the theatre, his achievement will be limited only by the breadth of his vision and the power of his imagination.

While it is not so easy to characterize the work of Sidney Coe Howard (1891-), his development has been in the direction of the domestic character play. After graduation

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

from the University of California in 1915 he took special courses with Professor Baker at Harvard, and has been engaged in editorial work on various magazines, since his return from the aviation service during the World War. This service is reflected in his share of *Bewitched*, already treated in the chapter on Sheldon's plays.

Howard began with romance, and his translations and adaptations such as *Sancho Panza* show his continued interest in the play which reflects the departure from the usual. *Swords* (1921) is a heroic play in a free blank verse, written for the ear and not the eye. The setting is the struggle between the Guelphs and Ghibellines but the playwright is concerned with this only as a colorful background to the central character, Fiamma, wife of Damiano, who is held as a hostage by Ugolino in his castle. The plot is at times absurd, and the play failed, but nevertheless it has some fine moments. The three men who love Fiamma—her husband, her jailer and Canetto, who betrays his master's trust for her and saves her from Ugolino, only to be killed by her inside her chamber door—are medieval, and Fiamma's momentary weakness before Canetto's passion is not badly indicated. *Swords* proved that Howard had imagination and a gift of expression.

With *They Knew What they Wanted* (1924) he showed that he had learned to write a compact play, to dare less and achieve more. To use his own expressive words, "I can get a kind of glamour around reality." He takes the Paolo and Francesca motive to California, and translates it, with modifications, into modern terms. Tony, an Italian wine grower of sixty, proposes marriage to Amy, a waitress whom he has admired at a distance. In order to win her he has sent, instead of his own photograph, one of Joe, a young American helper, whom he loves like a brother and who has written Tony's letters to her. When she arrives, she is shocked at her real husband and since Tony has been injured in his drive to the station to meet her, she gives herself to Joe that night. With the help of Pauline Lord's splendid interpretation, this inci-

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

dent was robbed somewhat of its sordidness. The subconscious power of expectant sexual gratification on Amy's part, made concrete by her recognition of Joe from his photograph, and the reaction from the resentment at the trick which has linked her to a man of Tony's years, were subtly portrayed by the actress who had played Anna Christie. Something fine in Amy and Joe's gratitude to Tony keep them from continuing the affair, and upon its discovery three months later Tony's action is also characteristic. At first he is about to kill Joe; then his love for Amy conquers and they decide to jog on together. One of the most interesting things about *They Knew What They Wanted* is the comparison it invites with Boker's *Francesca da Rimini*. To the audience, the ending is "satisfactory" in Bronson Howard's use of the word. We do not want Tony to be left alone and we do not want Amy, whatever her momentary impulse of passion, to go away with Joe. For we have been made to sympathize with all three of the leading characters; furthermore, their very limitations have made them unsuitable for tragedy. It was far different when Lanciotto, Paolo and Francesca played out their tragedy in Boker's great drama. They were lofty souls who could not go on with the stain of guilt upon them. But Tony and Amy can go on quite cheerfully. It is perhaps the difference between the Thirteenth and Twentieth Centuries. But the point is that both plays, the great tragedy and the fine domestic drama, ring true to their own standards. The play was one of the season's successes and won the Pulitzer Prize.

Lucky Sam McCarver (1925) failed, for reasons which are given in the preface to the published play, a dramatic document in which Howard reveals his ability to analyze his own weaknesses, together with an irrepressible youthfulness which is responsible for them—and also for much of the charm of his work. He attributes the failure of the play to its episodic character, to the fact that it is a biography of two characters, Sam McCarver, the proprietor of a night club on Second Avenue, and Carlotta Ashe, a woman of fashion who marries him

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

because of the physical attraction he has for her, and partly because of his chivalric assumption of a murder which would have damaged her reputation if it had not been kept quiet through his influence. There are strong moments in the play and the two main characters are well portrayed. But a reading of the printed version reveals one difficulty. Howard has felt it necessary to explain by the stage directions, again and again, the emotions which the text may not make clear. Now the text of a play should not need so much explanation, and the necessity arises often from Howard's desire to make his dialogue so subtle that it is too elusive. He is depending upon the actor of course, but his own words in the preface show that he appraises the actor's part in the joint creation too highly, for he puts him above the dramatist.

A comparison with *The Boss*, in which a similar situation had been developed, reveals another weakness. So real is Sam McCarver that it is difficult to sympathize with him, and the last few minutes of the play in which he leaves Carlotta's dead body to go to a business appointment, while probably reflecting his character exactly, leave an audience in revolt. Sheldon knew his theatre better and he made Regan a more likable fellow without making him any less real. *Lucky Sam McCarver* failed, but it is an interesting piece of dramatic literature nevertheless. Its influence upon such recent successes as *Broadway* are clear, but the characters of *Broadway* are not of the same material as the characters of *Lucky Sam McCarver*.

There was a distinct advance in *Ned McCobb's Daughter* (1926) over the earlier plays. In Carrie McCobb, Howard epitomized one kind of New England character, the shrewd, courageous, honest woman who fights hard for her children's future, who forgives her worthless husband until she finds out that he has been unfaithful to her with her own housemaid, and who never wastes a moment in idle regrets. Her father, Captain McCobb, is of the race of New England sea captains that is now extinct. He has given up a fortune to protect

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

his good name and he has descended to the position of captain of a ferryboat. But neither he nor his daughter sees any disgrace in her earning an honest living by her "Spa." What alone is of importance is the preservation of their self-respect. When the revelation comes that her husband, George Callahan, has robbed the ferry company, Captain McCobb squares himself to meet the blow and raise the money to pay the sum that will buy the silence of the company. He is willing to do anything that will keep his daughter and his grand-children from disgrace. But when George, a worthless ex-convict from the New York East Side, attempts to threaten him with the possibility of the Captain's being held as an accomplice, the fury of the old man brings on the stroke that means death. His daughter carries on, and meets, one after another, the disasters in her way. With her father lying dead in the alcove of the old McCobb parlor, she has not time for grief. When her brother-in-law, Babe Callahan, who has "dropped in on them" tries to comfort her she says:

I'm all right. Thinkin' 'bout Pa's pleasant. I loved Pa. Only 'tain't thinkin', is it? What I was jest doin'. It's feelin'. . . . Seems like folks kin feel 'bout no end of things, but I don't reckon they think 'bout much 'cept money.

Babe Callahan is a well-drawn picture of a bootlegger operating on a large scale, who desires to use Carrie's barn as a storehouse for liquor. His admiration for her courage, his scorn for his weakling of a brother and his ruthless seizure of the opportunity her need of money affords him, are vividly portrayed. He who at first has seemed to be a source of help, turns out to be a menace to the lives of her children. But the woman who has brushed aside the condolence of the lawyer who has had to tell her of her desperate plight, with the words: "The sooner we know the worst, the more time we hev t' think," foils the bootlegger by a clever trick. First she obtains an extra thousand dollars by convincing him that she needs an extension to her "Spa" to cover up the sudden appearance of the crowd of bootleggers who will make life unbearable for

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

her. Then handing him her note for the amount of her debt to him, she calmly tells him the Federal agents are in the outer room and she gives him just enough time to escape. The friends she has planted in the outer restaurant answer cheerfully for the supposed agents and to Callahan's ears all Maine dialect sounds alike. He tears up the note, is frank in his admiration of her skill in thwarting him, and departs, leaving her in possession of the field. Notwithstanding the fine performance of Clare Eames as Carrie Callahan and a competent cast in general, the play reads even better than it acts, for the character contrasts have time to develop and every character rings true to life.

The Silver Cord (1926) while it has not an equal skill in the character drawing, stirs one more profoundly upon the stage, for it deals with a deeper stratum of human emotion, and it was not disturbed by the rattle of comedy, sometimes overstressed in *Ned McCobb's Daughter*. It is difficult to estimate what the effect of *The Silver Cord* might have been, had the central character, Mrs. Phelps, been interpreted by an actress of less skill than Laura Hope Crews. She brought out every shade in the character of a mother who loves her two sons with a passion that passes the maternal, which dominates their lives, breaks off the engagement of one and nearly wrecks the marriage of the other. Catlike, she prowls about the walls of their other affections which threaten to keep her out, weakening them by innuendo and undermining them by deft appeals to sympathy, until she is ready to pounce upon what is left of their love. There are some high points in *The Silver Cord*. The ending of Act II, Scene 1, when Hester, the *fiancée* of Robin, the younger son, breaks down under the strain of the broken engagement and warns Christina, the married daughter-in-law, that she must take her unborn baby away from "this awful house," is tense with unuttered terrors. And the final battle between Mrs. Phelps and Christina for David is even more intense. What stirs the audience is the way each woman fights. Mrs. Phelps draws a vivid picture of the things



Sinclair Hornet

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

she has given up for her sons, but she never steps out of the picture of Victorian motherhood. Christina, the modern girl scientist, strips the situation of reticence in language that startles us with its verity. Each in her way secures the sympathy of her hearers, but Christina wins her husband, leaving Robin a prey to his mother-complex forever. The weakness of *The Silver Cord* lies in the characters of the sons. While the women are finely drawn, David and Robin are not worth fighting over, and the drama would be more significant if there were any real struggle in their minds or hearts. But they are merely confused. In drama a conflict is increased in value by the importance of the object of the battle. Yet the excellence of Howard's work is proved by the way we speculate about his characters. With a sense of the stage that is unusual, he affects to believe a play is less difficult to write than a story. Part of this is assumed, of course, but the prospect of his continued artistic success rests on the fact that he is first a sketcher of character, secondly a man of the theatre.

Like Howard, Maxwell Anderson (1888-) has made some contribution in literature outside of the theatre. He was born in western Pennsylvania but his youth was spent in North Dakota, where he studied at the State University, and later taught English at Leland Stanford University. After seven years of teaching, he became an editorial writer on *The San Francisco Bulletin*, the *New Republic*, the *New York Evening Globe* and later the *New York World*.

Anderson's first play to see the stage in New York City, *White Desert* (1923), was a somber tragedy of North Dakota, which failed, but which gave promise on account of its imaginative power. There are only five characters and the tragedy ensues through the loneliness of life upon the snowy plains on which Michael Kane, Sverre Peterson and their wives are driven in upon each other for company. Kane is insanely jealous of his wife, and while this is natural so far as her immediate relations with Sverre are concerned, his extortion of a confession from her as to her past emotions is not natural in the kind of

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Irishman Michael Kane is supposed to be. Michael Kane might have a reverence for womanly purity that would lead him to demand a higher standard for her than for himself, but he would fight, not to destroy that purity, but to preserve it. His suspicions, translated into her mind and coming back to him after distortion, lead to the final catastrophe. He shoots her after her guilt with Sverre has been confessed and forgiven, for he cannot live with the prospect of another betrayal. *White Desert* showed the influence of the Scandinavian drama and is of interest chiefly as the beginning of Anderson's career.

In 1924 Anderson collaborated with Laurence Stallings in *What Price Glory*. Stallings, born in Georgia in 1894, and graduating from Wake Forest College in 1915, was in newspaper work until he enlisted in the United States Marine Corps in 1917. Rising to a captaincy, he was wounded at Belleau Wood, in June, 1918, and suffered an amputation of the leg. Returning to the United States he re-engaged in newspaper work and met Anderson on the staff of the *World*. Together they conceived of a new kind of war play, in which the unromantic, hard, daily grind of war would be represented. Wisely they chose for their leading characters two regular army men, Captain Flagg and Top Sergeant Quirk, and the spirit of the professional soldier, rare in our war plays, came as a novelty to the audiences, whose approval was unquestioned. Flagg and Quirk have nothing of the glamour of war, and they are not in it for a glorious adventure. They are in it to stay. They hate each other, for past rivalries and injuries, and their rivalry is made concrete by their passing passion for Charmaine, the daughter of a French tavern keeper. This thin plot carried the episodic scenes, and the philosophy of war from the point of view of a sergeant was explained with a profanity which was realistic but which since it could not do justice to the actual conditions, was perhaps unnecessarily violent for the purpose of art. Some of the play, like the episode of the General and his staff, was absurd, but

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

the scene in the dugout cellar in a disputed town was masterly. The last scene threatened to end in violent melodrama, and then the playwrights saved the play by a touch of fine art. Flagg is worn out and drunk; but when the call to take the company in again comes, he responds with a curse. Then out of an inner room Quirk, wounded and flighty with fever, sallies. With a jest to Charmaine, their mutual mistress, he staggers out of the door. "Hey, Flagg," he calls, "wait for baby!" as the curtain falls. It was the note of quiet immediate response to duty, without display, that lifted *What Price Glory* out of melodrama into something higher.

Anderson and Stallings collaborated in two more plays, both of which failed at the Plymouth Theatre in 1925. *First Flight* is a romance of North Carolina in the last decade of the Eighteenth Century. The central character is Captain Andy Jackson, who represents the State of North Carolina, and has come down to "The Free State of Franklin" to prevent the separation of the western counties from the parent state. He fights two duels and acts generally as a romantic figure. The play has some merit as a picture of life at that time, undoubtedly fanciful, but without very much bombast. The character of Charity Clarkson is also not badly done. *The Buccaneer*, which is laid in Panama City in the 1600's, is a melodrama dealing with Captain Henry Morgan, a privateer, and Lady Elizabeth Neville. It is almost impossible to take the play seriously, as the language is stilted and the situations are improbable.

The collaborators parted company, but continued to produce dramatic work of a different kind. Stallings has been occupied with the moving pictures and has been successful in that field. He also wrote the book and lyrics for a striking opera, *Deep River* (1926), laid in New Orleans about 1830. The plot labors under the restrictions of opera but the performance was full of color and made an approach to life. The lyrics at times were very effective, especially in the scene in

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the voodoo den, where the music of Frank Harling combined with the words to establish a mood of terror.

Anderson produced in 1925 a play of tramp life, based on Jim Tully's autobiography, *Beggars of Life*. The scene shifts from a "hobo camp" in North Dakota, through a box car on a railroad to an abandoned "claim shack" in Montana, and the codes and standards of tramps were revealed in an entertaining if episodic manner. There was really no play, for the runaway romance of Little Red and Edna was not enough to build one on. Anderson did much better work in *Saturday's Children* (1927), and it is interesting to see him return to domestic drama after his excursions, either alone or with Stallings, into melodrama. The first Act of *Saturday's Children* is a remarkable picture of the methods by which a young man who is in love but intends to have his life adventure first, is led to propose marriage to a girl to whom marriage and life adventure are the same thing. The second Act, in which the young married pair quarrel, is reminiscent of *The First Year*, of course, but it is much more of a character study and there is a wistful searching for happiness, especially on the part of the wife, that is very appealing. Then after Anderson had separated them he apparently did not know what to do with them, for the device by which he brings about a reconciliation in the drab boarding house to which she has fled, is theatrical rather than dramatic. But there is a quiet restraint in *Saturday's Children*, a sympathy with human weakness rather than a caricature of it, which points to a growing surety in Anderson's art.

A playwright of some achievement, Lewis Beach, began with one-act dramas of which *The Clod*, produced by the Washington Square Players in 1916, had the merit of revealing the part little things play in important decisions. *A Square Peg* (1924) is a tragedy of the managing woman who drives all her family out of her life. Her husband becomes a suicide, her daughter runs away with a married man and her son enlists in the navy after a disgraceful affair. Beach is entitled

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

to credit for the relentless treatment of the situation. The difficulty is that the people are not made important enough to render the tragedy significant. He was affected by the artistic delusion that it makes no difference what your material is, provided you let it develop logically. But no one in the audience really cared what became of the family. In his next play, *The Goose Hangs High* (1924), he had learned a lesson and he gave a much more human picture of a family in a small city in the Middle West, in which the relations of parents and children were treated with sympathy and understanding. The truth that parents care more for their children than their children care for them is brought out with fidelity to fact that is startling in its detail. But Beach had the good sense to show the reaction of the same children to the situation in which their father is placed by his honesty and the ending is just as true to nature as *The Square Peg* was, but it is vastly more interesting. In consequence, *The Goose Hangs High* succeeded. *Ann Vroome* is a return to tragedy and is sincere in its treatment of the dilemma in which many a woman is placed. But it has not the human quality of *The Goose Hangs High*.

Several playwrights of promise in this field of the domestic character drama have appeared sporadically. Leon Cunningham gave to the Equity Players in 1922 a fine tragedy in *Hospitality*, in which the central character was a mother who has been so busy working for her children that she has had no time to love them. Her death after she has saved her son from a marriage that would have eventually broken his life, left one with a feeling of exaltation, not depression. *Wild Birds* by Dan Totheroh, which was first produced by the University of California and then had a brief run in New York in 1925, is a tragedy of aspiration, thwarted by association with crass unseeing people, in the Middle West. There is an appeal in the pathetic love story of Mazie, an orphan, and Adam Larsen, a refugee from the Reform School, who elope and are brought back to the terrible farm of the Slags. Adam

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

is beaten to death by John Slag and Mazie drowns herself in the well. While the situation is old the treatment is not shrill or wild, and the idea of having their emotions excited by the chanting and drumming of old Robert, the crazy man, is not bad. The play is a promise perhaps of better things.

Not so promising, but still worthy of recording, was *A Man's Man* (1925) by Patrick Kearney. This is a realistic drama of medium American life, with some real approach to fidelity. It is supposed to deal with the middle generation in America in its progress from rags to riches. Apparently the author wishes to show it on its ridiculous or pitiful side, and he succeeds. The character of Melville Tuttle, very well played by Dwight Frye, is representative of those young American men without much ability but with a great deal of conceit and ambition. He almost succeeds in making one like him at the end of the play, when he and his wife, having gone through all their trials and tribulations, plan a great future for their son who is to be, although they feel that they themselves will not reach that future.

That it is a significant and a promising group of playwrights which this chapter chronicles, needs no emphasis. Nearly all of them are young, judged either by the calendar or by the more intangible but more accurate test of the spirit. They may be discouraged at times by unfortunate conditions but they love the theatre; they know it and they know life. Their danger is that in the effort to give a faithful picture of life they will be satisfied with the usual. But it is just because they have kept their sanity, because they have declined to be different just for the sake of difference, that their work shines in comparison with that other group, more noisy than important, who insist on breaking the mould of the drama in order to represent through its fragments, a symbolic picture of life. The shrill staccato of *Roger Bloomer*, of *Processional*, of *Pinwheel*, leads nowhere, despite the unquestioned sincerity of their writers. This is partly because their authors

THE NEW REALISM OF CHARACTER

forget that there are two principles, old as the hills, which every product of art must possess, unity and variety, and that neither alone will suffice. Without the fusing power of imagination, mere violence arrives not at a new technique but only at a new form of confusion.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES

ONE of the most significant tendencies in recent American play writing has been its search for material among primitive life, remote from the large centers of population. The impulse is a healthful one, for it is among these unsophisticated people that characters represent themselves freely and that strong passions and emotions may be represented without running into melodrama. Natives types, too, are to be found in these regions, and faults and virtues are therefore indigenous. It is obvious that if such provincial types are to be sought, they must be picturesque and provide contrast. The decadent primitives in northeastern Pennsylvania or in parts of New England, where the ambitious have departed, leaving a drab reminder of former virility, are not suitable fields. These have been found rather in the West or in the mountain regions of the Carolinas, of Georgia and Kentucky, where the climate and other circumstances have preserved the virility of the people.

Mrs. Burnett had seen the possibilities of this mountain race as early as 1881, when *Esmeralda* dramatized a contrast between them and the civilization of Europe. But while novelists have long made use of this material, the drama has turned to it only sporadically, until in very recent years. The credit for an interesting development, which was amateur in its inception, but which culminated in 1926-7 in the production of two plays on the professional stage in New York, is to be given to Professor Frederick H. Koch. In 1910 he founded the Dakota Playmakers at the University of North Dakota and produced there not only pageants like *The Pageant of the*

THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES

North West (1914) and *Shakespeare the Playmaker* (1916) but also stimulated the writing of plays growing out of the lives of the students who themselves acted in the dramas thus created. In 1918 he was attracted by the promise of the field of mountaineer life and began his work as Professor of Dramatic Literature at the University of North Carolina. Here he has developed something unique in playmaking, which has been imitated of course in other places. It differs essentially from the work of Professor Baker, of Harvard and Yale, whose stimulating courses attract students who are already playwrights in embryo, whose plays bear no relation in locale to Cambridge or New Haven and whose ambition is the professional theatre. At North Carolina the students are concerned with the material around them, drawn from a civilization that has remained homogeneous. The plays are community dramas in the proper sense—not pageants but plays with real characters and situations. More important, while they deal with the material of North Carolina, the best of them could be produced anywhere.

The Carolina Playmakers are not limited, in production, to Carolina. Their tours reach south to Georgia and north to Washington, in the Playmakers' omnibus, in which they also carry the scenery. Anyone who has traveled with them on their trips will not soon forget the enthusiasms, not only of their director, but of the entire group. They are truly taking the folk drama to the people. The limitations of such an organization are perhaps obvious. Undergraduates can never give performances of professional certainty and the Playmakers cannot with their shifting personnel develop into such artistry as the Provincetown Players or the Neighborhood Players. Their performances are therefore not so important as the plays that have been written for them, and, fortunately, two volumes of these one-act plays have been published.¹ They deal with superstitions still extant at least in tradition—such as

¹In *Carolina Folk-Plays*, edited by F. L. Koch, 1922 and 1924. See COLLECTIONS.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the striking dramas of the supernatural *When Witches Ride* by Elizabeth (Lay) Green, or her vivid picture of the Eighteenth Century witchcraft in *Trista*. The romance of old traditions is given in *Off Nag's Head*, by Donald MacMillan, which places on the stage the last moments of Theodosia Burr, daughter of Aaron Burr, victim of the land pirates who preyed on that coast in the early days. It soon becomes apparent that the best work has been done by Paul Green, whose *The Last of the Lowries* was produced in 1920. This one-act play, laid in 1874, deals with the visit to his home of an outlaw who pays the penalty for his desire to see his mother once more. These outlaws, the Lowrie gang, were a well-known band, partly Croatan Indian, who had resisted the conscription of the Confederate Government and had proceeded from defensive to offensive war. The last Lowrie was killed in 1874. Legend attributes the origin of the tribe to Sir Walter Raleigh's lost colony of 1590, who may indeed have been carried away by the Indians. Old Cumba Lowrie, who has lost her husband and two sons, and who waits for news that Henry and Steve will return, while in fact Steve is dead and Henry's captors are closing in upon him, is a strange and powerful figure. Suddenly the shot is heard, which tells her that the last Lowrie has been killed, and she meets the doom with dignity.

Cumba: Yes, it's better that-a-way, I reckon. An' I won't be livin' in hope and fear no mo', will I? And when the owls hoot through the swamp at night, and the whippoorwills sing in the thicket at dark, I won't have cause to think that's one o' my own a-givin' of 'is signals, an' tryin' to slip back to 'is ol' home, the only place he loves,—will I? An' I won't lie awake at night, thinkin' they're in danger . . . for He's done give 'em His peace at last.

Another striking one-act play, *The Scuffletown Outlaws* (1924), was built upon this outlaw band. The author, William Norment Cox, has lived from his boyhood near the settlement of the Lowries and his forefathers helped to exterminate them, one falling in the struggle. In the play, he acted Henry



A SCENE FROM *THE SCUFFLETOWN OUTLAWS*, A PLAY OF THE NORTH CAROLINA
MOUNTAINEERS

THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES

Berry Lowrie, the chieftain. With a sense for contrasts, he brought in an outside influence, John Sanders, who has come among the outlaws to gain their confidence and then betray them to the law for the reward. But Sanders is so impressed by the tragic situation which fate and their own actions have brought on them, that he refuses at the last moment to carry out his bargain. Their suspicions have been aroused, however, and he is shot by Steve Lowrie, through the window of the house, after he had been allowed to escape.¹

The tragedy of a "tenant-farm woman" is revealed in *Fixin's* by Paul and Erma Green, (1924). And in more than one of the plays the conditions wrought out of the limitation of opportunity which generations of separation from progressive civilization have brought about, are revealed with sympathy. Comedy is not neglected, either, but the comedies seem not to be so significant as the serious plays. One of the most successful comedies of courtship, *In Dixon's Kitchen*, has not been published, since much of the fun depends upon the stage business.

The test of the importance of such a movement as the Carolina Playmakers lies, of course, in the development of a creative dramatist. Paul Green seems to be such an artist. After his war service he returned to the University of North Carolina, where he is now a member of the Faculty of Philosophy. In his volume, *The Lord's Will and Other Carolina Plays* (1925), the most vivid are the romances of the earlier days—like *The Old Man of Edenton* and *Blackbeard*, the latter dealing with the pirate who first appeared in drama in Lemuel Sawyer's *Blackbeard* in 1824. There is a different charm in *The No 'Count Boy*, a negro comedy, which won the Belasco cup when produced by the players of the Dallas Little Theatre in New York in 1925. Here Green dramatized the philosophy of the attraction of the vagabond.

It was natural that Green should turn for sharper con-

¹ *The Scuffletown Outlaws* was published in *The Southwest Review*, XI (April 1926), pp. 179-204.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

trasts to the negro, both because of the greater emotional possibilities, in a race that lives by feeling, and also because of the tragedies that come from the contact of white and black. The most significant of his one-act plays of negro life are to be found in the volume, *Lonesome Road* (1926). The preface, breathing deep sympathy for the lot of the negro, explains why Green can write so well about him. Of these plays perhaps the most powerful is the poignant tragedy of *White Dresses*. The symbol of the white dress sent by a white boy to Mary, the mulatto girl, as a farewell when she is being forced by her own white father and his, into a marriage with a negro, is remarkable in its restraint. A striking figure is Aunt Candace, the negress who burns up the white dress together with its faded yellowish prototype, sent nineteen years before to her sister, Mary's mother, by the man who is forcing his own daughter into marriage with a negro she loathes. The tragedy ends with the swiftness of fine art in Aunt Candace's acceptance of the inevitable, as she turns from the ashes of the two white dresses—"I knows yo' feelin's, chile, but you's gut to smother 'em in. You's gut to smother 'em in."

Two of the plays, *In Abraham's Bosom* and *Your Fiery Furnace*, deal with the tragedy of frustrated ambition on the part of a negro. These became portions of Green's play of seven scenes, *In Abraham's Bosom*, which created a profound impression when produced at the Provincetown Theatre in 1926, and won the Pulitzer Prize. While Green shows the apparent hopelessness of the effort of Abraham McCranie to help his race, the playwright is concerned not with propaganda, but with the tragedy of an individual. Abraham is the son of a white man, and his mixed blood is a symbol of the struggle going on between his intellectual gropings for higher things and his passionate nature which handicaps him through marriage with Goldie McAllister, and makes him also unfit to be a leader of men. His story runs logically through to disaster. Scoffed at by the whites and jeered at by his own race, he falls finally by the bullets of the avengers of his mur-

THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES

der of his white half brother, who has been his evil genius. While too shrill at times and at others too wordy, the drama as a whole stirred the audience deeply, for it was the biography of a brave soul, defeated by circumstances and by his own limitations, with a spirit above his possible achievement. The colored characters were taken by negroes and the scenes in the turpentine woods in 1885 among the field hands, and later in the cabin of Abraham, were faithfully represented. One of the best-drawn characters was Muh Mack, Abraham's aunt, who represented the old unprogressive negress, and her comments on her nephew aided in the note of comedy which lightened the play at times.

Green returned in *The Field God* (1927) to the narrow life of the Southern white, not of the mountaineer, but of the farmer folk of eastern North Carolina. Hardy Gilchrist, the central character, is a study of a man of exceptional virility, linked to an ailing wife. He turns to youth in the person of Rhoda, his wife's niece, who loves him in return. Green establishes well the struggle of two vibrant natures against the deadly narrowness of the community that surrounds them. They are not sordid; they preserve their self-respect until one overpowering impulse bids them give way and brings on Mrs. Gilchrist's death. From this point the drama is too long drawn out. The suicide of Neill, Rhoda's suitor, shocks but does not stimulate us; the efforts of the preacher and his aids to save Hardy's soul are interminable and even the death of Rhoda's little child leaves us cold. Green has forgotten that on the stage too much misery makes an audience cease to believe in it. The ending which leaves Hardy and Rhoda in each other's arms, having rejected all gods but themselves, is curious rather than conclusive. There is a deep flavor in *The Field God* of the long stretches of North Carolina fields, unmarked by human habitation. But this after all is epic, not dramatic.

How much influence upon other playwrights the success of the Carolina Playmakers has had it is difficult to estimate.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

But it is hardly probable that the appearance upon the New York stage of four plays of the mountaineers in one year (1923-4) could have been entirely accidental. The first of these to be produced, *Sun-Up*, was by Lula Vollmer, who was born in Keyser, North Carolina, and learned to know the mountaineers during her summer vacations among them. Miss Vollmer wrote plays as a girl and when she became the treasurer of the box office of the Theatre Guild at the Garrick Theatre, she had already written *Sun-Up*. It was suggested by a story she heard in May, 1918, of a Southern boy, who, upon arriving in camp, exclaimed, "Air this hyar France?" She dramatized this note of provincialism but as the play grew the central character became his mother, the widow Cagle, and in her became personified the hereditary opposition to that dread abstraction, the law, which had killed her husband, and insisted upon taking her boy from her, to fight in a quarrel too remote for her sympathy.

Her attitude was not a bit overstressed. It is well known that not only during the Civil War but even during the World War many of the mountaineers refused to serve in the army on the ground that they were not interested in the matter and it was not their war. But Miss Vollmer shows also in Rufe Cagle the feeling of the younger generation that the hills which had nourished them were worth fighting for. The marriage ceremony of Rufe and Emmy before he goes, the helplessness of the illiterate mother when the telegram comes announcing his death, her long vigil through the night, as she sits smoking by the fire and resumes her daily round in the morning light, are portrayed with utter simplicity. When she speaks it is in brief sentences. Her good-by is, "If ye fight, shoot to kill—" and then, "Well, take care o' yo'self"—and her philosophy of life is summed up in her words to the deserter who has sought shelter in her cabin, and whom she is protecting at the risk of her own life: "I ain't afeered and thar ain't no danger unless ye air afeered." *Sun-Up* was put on the stage at the Provincetown Theatre, May 24, 1923, by an independent

THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES

group of producers, and after running a year, it went on tour. It had a triumphal reception in London and has been produced in Amsterdam. The performance of Lucille La Verne as the Widow Cagle was one of the achievements of modern acting.

Lula Vollmer's second play, *The Shame Woman* (1923), while more conventional in the form in which it was produced, is another tragedy. *Sun-Up* closed on a note of exaltation, in which a mother's love passed beyond the limits of life to commune for a moment with the spirit of the son she had lost. In *The Shame Woman* Lize Burns dies on the scaffold to keep from her own lifelong stain the adopted daughter who has been betrayed by her guardian's earlier seducer. Martha Case, the midwife, who represents the brooding figure of implacable fate, is as striking a creation as anything that the Russian stage has evolved. The play, as Miss Vollmer first wrote it, ended not in the jail but in the open air as the Shame Woman walked to the scaffold through the crowd who had come to scoff and who remained to pray. The gaunt figure of the midwife remained erect to the last; then the nobility of the woman at whom she had jeered brought even her to her knees. It is to be regretted that mere stage mechanics prevented the production of this scene.

The Duncce Boy (1925) is also laid in the North Carolina mountains. The central character is that of Tude Huckle, who is a half-wit, and yet has his emotional side developed beyond that of the normal human being. There is nothing morbid in the representation of abnormality, but the best character is that of his mother. She has nursed him and defended him against the cruelty of his father because she feels that the sawmill has entered into his pre-natal life in a strange and unwonted way, and that in a sense she was responsible for not insisting upon leaving a neighborhood in which she was unhappy. The sound of the saw runs through the play like the *motif* of an opera, and at the end, in a moment of intense exultation, caused by Rosie Pierce's kiss, Tude rushes out of

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the house and is caught and killed by the great saw. The other characters are background, and Miss Vollmer herself was not as much interested in them as she should have been. But there is an imaginative quality in *The Duncce Boy*, as in all of Miss Vollmer's plays, which distinguishes them from the usual domestic drama.

The comedy of the North Carolina mountaineers has been represented on the professional stage by two plays of Hatcher Hughes. Hughes has been a lecturer on the drama at Columbia and in 1921 had collaborated with Elmer Rice in a play for Mrs. Fiske, *Wake Up, Jonathan*. In the first of his mountain plays, *Hell-Bent Fer Heaven*, the central character, Rufe Pryor, is a curious mixture of religious cant and jealous passion, who in order to win the girl he desires, revives a slumbering feud between the Hunts and the Lowrys and nearly brings death and ruin upon them both. Hughes evolves this situation through a dialogue that is crisp and direct and holds the note of comedy by the uncanny hypocrisy of Rufe in contrast with the rough sincerity of the other characters. Hughes evidently knows his people. The hold that evangelical faith has over the women of both families, the unreasoning impulse of the feud, the triumph of common sense in the eighty-year-old grandfather, all were ably interpreted by a well-chosen cast. After all, it is the creation of character that is the acid test of drama, and Rufe Pryor will remain long in the memory as a human portrait, convincing and enduring. By a mistaken direction, the ending, delightfully ironic, which leaves Rufe imprisoned, in danger of the flood, and abandoned by his enlightened dupes to the mercy of a God with whom he has assumed such an intimate acquaintance, was changed to a rescue, and the play was weakened. It won the Pulitzer Prize, however, for the season of 1923-4.

Ruint (1925) is an amusing comedy laid in the North Carolina mountains. It has not as much significance as *Hell-Bent Fer Heaven*, because one can hardly believe that Mary Jane Horton would pretend to be ruined in order to obtain revenge

THE DRAMA OF THE PROVINCES

upon her philandering suitor. In other words, the situation does not seem probable enough to excite either our intense sympathy or our sense of comedy. The best characters are the two mothers, Mrs. Horton and Mrs. Akins, who represent the conservative attitude, although not the attitude of the men of the family. The most insistent note struck in *Ruint* was that of the contentment of the mountain people with their own civilization, and their scorn of the city. When Mrs. Horton exclaims, "Think o' havin' to buy every mess o' gyarden truck that ye eat!" and Mrs. Akins replies, "La, that's nothin'! I've hyeard they even have to pay fer the water they drink," Mrs. Horton pronounces final judgment: "Well, all I got to say is that folks that's fool enough to live in sich a place 'tain't no matter fer 'em." After all, they have solved the problem of existence much after Thoreau's philosophy.

Percy MacKaye's *This Fine-Pretty World*, laid in the Kentucky mountains, has already been discussed. It is highly probable that other districts will be treated in drama, but the progress of civilization will push the frontier line further into the mountains and its social life will become less picturesque. The plays of the provinces may become therefore an episode in our dramatic history, but that episode is fruitful and significant.

CHAPTER XXIV

A WORD IN RETROSPECT

WE HAVE seen how upon the crumbling fashions of the earlier drama Augustin Daly built the foundations of modern playwriting in America, how, with his encouragement, Bronson Howard accomplished what the playwrights of an earlier day had found impossible, and the profession of the dramatist was established in the United States. Under their leadership the fight for fidelity to actual life began. From the writers of fiction and poetry came encouragement, critical and creative, especially from Howells. In the theatre itself, Herne carried the struggle farther and became its chief representative, but Thomas and Gillette and Fitch each helped establish realism of setting and of action. Alongside of this movement toward the realistic treatment of actual life, the creation of types, drawn from observation of life but intensified for the theatre, persisted in the work of Harrigan and Hoyt in the East, of Bret Harte, Mark Twain and Bartley Campbell in the West. Allied to both groups in his earlier days, Belasco broke from them and indulged his predilection for romance, for the selection of material that was unusual, and its treatment in an idealistic fashion, until he produced, with Long, the supreme creations of that species. His romance, however, was of a different calibre from the older heroic verse play, which had its survival and indeed has never lost its hold.

While aware of the achievements of European dramatists, the playwrights who began their work in the Nineteenth Century remained largely unaffected by them. Compared with the Scandinavian dramatists, the Americans at first glance seem immature. But to anyone who witnessed the productions

A WORD IN RETROSPECT

of Ibsen and his followers, like Sudermann and Hauptmann, on the German stage during the closing years of the century, their apparent maturity is the over-ripeness of an older civilization, leading to a narrowness and weariness of outlook which is merely different, not more profound, than the outlook of our playwrights. What our drama lacked in maturity it made up in a freshness and a progressive quality which distinguish it from the drama of pessimism.

Were it necessary, it would be possible to defend it even from the charge of inexperience. Edouard Bourdet, in analyzing the reason for the decline in European drama to-day, remarks that "With the growth of cosmopolitanism, the doctrine of political and social equality, the intermingling of races and of classes, little remains to-day of all those suppositions upon which the most striking dramatic works of the last century are founded."¹ But our drama reflects a civilization that has passed already through these stages.

When Moody began the impulse which is at the root of American drama in the Twentieth Century, his inspiration was Greek rather than Scandinavian. His artistic creed was young and clear-eyed and virile with optimism. His followers have left few themes untouched, but they have dealt with them sincerely, in the main, and they have not usually called to their aid the methods of comparative pathology.

As in the earlier days, realistic treatment of familiar life and idealistic treatment of romantic material have progressed side by side during the Twentieth Century. There has been a sharpening of the technique, a freedom in experiment, a general craftsmanship that can be appreciated best when our living playwrights are compared not only with the large figures of the late Nineteenth Century but with the many whose names have disappeared. Even those who choose romantic material like Sheldon and Moeller and Hazelton, have recognized that there is no reason why they should not profit by the advance in the realistic method of treatment, and have made

¹ "The Play in Transition," *Theatre Arts Monthly*, XI, (February, 1927), 107.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

that combination which is sanctioned by the successes of literature.

The most hopeful sign of all is the recognition that has come to O'Neill. Independent, courageous, he has proved that an artist can win recognition by remaining true to his standards. Moreover, like Moody he lighted his torch at the fire of Greek inspiration and has shown again that the poet is the hope of the drama. The poet may go out of fashion for a time, but whether he speak in prose or verse, it is the man of imagination who writes drama that lasts. Keeness of observation is not enough; skill in expression is not enough; courage to enter the dark places of the soul is not enough—the dramatist must have the power to draw from any worthy material, beauty and truth, by the force of that imagination which placed them there, and to speak to us through his characters in the language which the heart understands and remembers. It is because I believe there are more playwrights to-day in America who answer this description than in any other country in the world, that I need make no prophecy concerning the future, but may bring this record to a close.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY
AND
LIST OF AMERICAN PLAYS
1860-1927

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

THE Bibliography and Play List follow the general plan of my Bibliography of the Early Drama in the *Cambridge History of American Literature*, rather than that of the Bibliography of *The History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War*. The great number of articles, mostly of a fugitive nature, demands that the Bibliography shall be selective, and forbids the extensive critical comments of the earlier volume, where the historical perspective was more definite. In the modern period the individual dramatist is better known to students and readers and therefore instead of separating the individual bibliographies and lists of plays it seemed best to bring all the information concerning a playwright together in one place.

Under each playwright's name are listed his plays, in the order of their performance. Where it seemed appropriate I have presented a complete list of the playwright's work. Owing in some cases to the mass of material, in others to the system of trying out a play on the road, it was obviously impracticable to make every list complete. In such cases I have presented a representative list of plays.

With each play is given the date of publication and the place and date of first production. Anyone familiar with the circumstances of production in America will recognize that errors are inevitable, and I have never hesitated to give information in one case because it was not available in every instance. For example, London performances were of interest when American playwrighting was becoming established. Today such performances are of much less significance. I have applied the same principle in giving the sources of the plays.

The material of this bibliography presents difficulties of a special kind. From 1860 to 1900 many plays remained unpublished, owing to insufficient copyright protection. But any attempt to distinguish between extant and non-extant plays, as I did in my earlier *History*, would be fruitless, since it is reasonably certain that nearly all these plays exist in some form. For this reason, the word "MS." has been added only in those cases in which I have actually identified the manuscript. Many plays have been issued without any date, and

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

the printed copyright date may indicate either the date of actual publication or merely the year in which application for copyright as a dramatic composition was filed at Washington. It may even indicate the year in which a novel was made out of the play. With the help of the publishers and of the useful list of Dramatic Compositions, published by the Copyright Office, this tangle has been solved so far as practicable.

Where place of publication or of performance is omitted, "New York" is to be understood.

I shall welcome heartily any corrections, in order that the facts may be finally established.

HISTORY AND CRITICISM OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA AND STAGE

BIOGRAPHIES of playwrights are included here only when they present a general picture of the drama of their time. Works referring to the whole field are ordinarily not repeated under the individual bibliographies.

"American Playwrights on the American Drama." *Harper's Weekly*, Supplement, Feb. 2, 1889.

ANDREWS, CHARLTON, *The Drama To-day*. Philadelphia, 1913.

ARCHER, WILLIAM, "The Development of American Drama," *Harper's Magazine*, CXLII (1920) 75-86.

ARVOLD, ALFRED G., *The Little Country Theater*. 1922.

BROWN, T. A., *A History of the New York Stage*. From the First Performance in 1732 to 1901. 3 Vols. 1903.

BURLEIGH, LOUISE, *The Community Theatre. In Theory and Practice*. Boston, 1917.

BURTON, RICHARD, *The New American Drama*. 1913.

CHENEY, SHELDON, *The New Movement in the Theatre*. 1914.

CHENEY, SHELDON, *The Open Air Theatre*. 1918.

CHENEY, SHELDON, *The Art Theater*. 1917; rev. 1925.

CLAPP, HENRY AUSTIN, *Reminiscences of a Dramatic Critic*. Boston, 1902.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- CLARK, BARRETT H., *The British and American Drama of To-day*. 1915.
- CLARK, BARRETT H., *A Study of the Modern Drama*. 1925.
- CRAWFORD, MARY C., *The Romance of the American Theatre*. Boston, 1913; rev. 1925.
- DALY, JOSEPH FRANCIS, *The Life of Augustin Daly*. 1917.
- DE GOVEIA, C. J., *The Community Playhouse*. 1923.
- DICKINSON, THOMAS H., *The Case of American Drama*. Boston, 1915.
- DICKINSON, THOMAS H., *The Insurgent Theatre*. 1917.
- DICKINSON, THOMAS H., *Playwrights of the New American Theater*. 1924.
- DRUMMOND, A. M., *Plays for the Country Theatre*. Cornell Extension Bulletin, No. 53, Ithaca, N. Y., June, 1922.
- EATON, WALTER PRICHARD, *The American Stage of To-day*. Boston. c. 1908.
- EATON, WALTER PRICHARD, *At the New Theatre and Others*. Boston, c. 1910.
- EATON, WALTER PRICHARD, *Plays and Players: Leaves From a Critic's Scrapbook*. Cincinnati, 1916.
- EATON, WALTER PRICHARD, *The Actor's Heritage*. Boston, c. 1924.
- EDWARDS, THOMAS R., "The Evolution of Play Publishing." *The Drama*, XV (March, 1925) 121-122.
- HAMILTON, CLAYTON, *The Theory of the Theatre*. 1910.
- HAMILTON, CLAYTON, *Studies in Stagecraft*. 1914.
- HAMILTON, CLAYTON, *Problems of the Playwright*. 1917.
- HAMILTON, CLAYTON, *Seen on the Stage*. 1920.
- HAMILTON, CLAYTON, *Conversations on the Contemporary Drama*. 1924.
- HALSEY, ABIGAIL F., *The Historical Pageant in the Rural Community*. Cornell Extension Bulletin, No. 54, Ithaca, N. Y., June 1922.
- HAPGOOD, NORMAN, *The Stage in America, 1897-1900*. 1901.
- HENDERSON, ARCHIBALD, *The Changing Drama*. 1914.
- HORNBLow, ARTHUR, *A History of the Theatre in America From Its Beginning to the Present Time*. 2 Vols. Philadelphia, 1919.
- HUTTON, LAURENCE, *Plays and Players*. 1875.
- HUTTON, LAURENCE, *Curiosities of the American Stage*. 1891.
- LEWISOHN, LUDWIG, *The Drama and the Stage*. 1922.
- MACGOWAN, KENNETH AND JONES, ROBERT EDMUND, *The Theatre of To-morrow*. 1921.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- MACKAYE, PERCY, *The Playhouse and the Play*. 1909.
- MACKAYE, PERCY, *The Civic Theatre*. 1912.
- MALEVINSKY, M. L., *The Science of Playwriting*. 1925.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER. "The American On The Stage," *Scribner's Monthly*, XVIII (July, 1879), 321-33.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *The Historical Novel and Other Essays*. 1901.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *Aspects of Fiction and Other Ventures in Criticism*. 1902.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *The Development of the Drama*. 1904.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *Inquiries and Opinions*. 1907.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *The American of the Future and Other Essays*. 1909.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *A Study of the Drama*. Boston, 1910.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *A Book About the Theater*. 1916.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *Principles of Playmaking*. 1919.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *Playwrights on Playmaking*. 1923.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, *Rip Van Winkle Goes to the Play, and Other Essays on Plays and Players*. 1926.
- MODERWELL, HIRAM K., *The Theatre of To-day*. 1914.
- MOSES, MONTROSE J., "The Drama, 1860-1918," *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, III, 266-298. Bibliography in IV, 760-774. 1921.
- MOSES, MONTROSE J., *The American Dramatist*. Boston, 1911; rev. 1925.
- PEIRCE, JAMES HARRY, *The Magazine and the Drama*. Dunlap Society Publications, Series 2, Vol. II. 1896.
- PHELPS, H. P., *Players of a Century. A Record of the Albany Stage. Including Notices of Prominent Actors who have appeared in America*. Albany, 1880; repr. 1890.
- PHELPS, WILLIAM LYON, *The Twentieth Century Theatre*. 1920.
- QUINN, ARTHUR H., "The Significance of Recent American Drama", *Scribner's Magazine*, LXXII (July, 1922) 97-108. Reprinted in *Contemporary American Plays*.
- RUHL, ARTHUR, *Second Nights*. 1914.
- SAYLER, OLIVER M., *Our American Theatre*. 1923.
- SHIPMAN, LOUIS EVANS, *The True Adventures of a Play*. 1914.
- STRANG, L. C., *Players and Plays of the Last Quarter Century*. 2 Vols. Boston, c. 1902.
- THOMAS, AUGUSTUS, *The Print of My Remembrance*. 1922.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- TOMPKINS, EUGENE, and KILBY, QUINCY, *The History of the Boston Theatre*. Boston, 1908.
- TOWSE, JOHN R., *Sixty Years of the Theater*. 1916.
- WILLARD, G. O., *History of the Providence Stage*. Providence, 1891.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *The Wallet of Time, Containing Personal, Biographical, and Critical Reminiscence of the American Theatre*. 2 Vols. 1913.
- YOUNG, STARK, *The Flower in Drama*. 1923.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND LISTS OF PLAYS

- ADAMS, W. DAVENPORT, *A Dictionary of the Drama*. Philadelphia, 1904. [Vol. I. A-G.]
- CARSON, LIONEL, ED., *The Stage Year Book*, from 1908: after 1909 gives American plays. London, 1908—
- Catalogue of the Dramas and Dramatic Poems contained in the Public Library of Cincinnati*. Cincinnati, 1879.
- CLAPP, J. B. and EDGETT, E. F., *Plays of the Present*. Dunlap Society Publications, Ser. 2, extra Vol. 1902.
- CLARENCE, REGINALD, *The Stage Cyclopaedia*. London, 1909. [For English performances of American plays].
- Dramatic Compositions Copyrighted in the United States, 1870-1916*. [Issued by the Copyright Office, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. This is most helpful and will be continued.]
- FAXSON, FREDERICK W., *The Dramatic Index*. Boston. From 1909 has been published annually as Part 2 of *The Annual Magazine Subject Index*.
- FAXSON, FREDERICK W., Editor, *The Bulletin of Bibliography and Dramatic Index*. Published quarterly. Boston.
- HASKELL, DANIEL C., *A List of American Dramas in the New York Public Library*. Revised January, 1916, from *Bulletin* of October, 1915.
- LAWREN, JOSEPH, *The Drama Year Book*. 1924.
- RODEN, R. F., *Later American Plays, 1831-1900*. Dunlap Society Publications, Ser. 2, Vol. XII. 1900.
- SHAY, FRANK, *A Guide to Longer Plays*. A List of Fifteen Hundred Plays for Little Theatres, Professional and Stock Companies, etc. 1925.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

BIOGRAPHIES OF ACTORS AND MANAGERS AND SIMILAR WORKS GIVING INFORMATION CONCERNING THE DRAMA

- BARRETT, LAWRENCE, *Charlotte Cushman, a Lecture*. Dunlap Society Publications, Ser. 1, Vol. IX. 1889.
- BARRYMORE, JOHN, *Confessions of an Actor*. Indianapolis, 1926.
- CLAPP, J. B. and EDGETT, E. F., *Players of the Present*. Dunlap Society Publications, Ser. 2, Vols. IX, XI, XIII. 1899-1901.
- CLARKE, JOSEPH I. C., *My Life and Memories*. 1925.
- CREAHAN, JOHN, *Life of Laura Keane*. Philadelphia, 1897.
- The Diary of a Daly Débutante* [Dora Knowlton]. 1910.
- DITHMAR, EDWARD A., *John Drew*. c. 1900.
- DREW, JOHN, *My Years on the Stage*. 1922.
- Autobiographical Sketch of Mrs. John Drew*. 1899.
- The Memories of Rose Eytinge*. 1905.
- FORD, JAMES L., *Forty Odd Years in the Literary Shop*. 1921.
- FROHMAN, DANIEL, *Memories of a Manager*. 1911.
- FROHMAN, DANIEL, and MARCOSSON, ISAAC F., *Charles Frohman*. 1916.
- GILBERT, MRS. ANNE H., *Stage Reminiscences*. Edited by C. M. Martin. 1901.
- GROSSMAN, EDWINA BOOTH, *Edwin Booth, Recollections by His Daughter*. 1902.
- HUTTON, LAURENCE, *Edwin Booth*. 1893.
- ISMAN, FELIX, *Weber and Fields*. 1924.
- The Autobiography of Joseph Jefferson*. 1890.
- LEAVITT, M. B., *Fifty Years of Theatrical Management*. 1912.
- MAEDER, CLARA FISHER, *Autobiography*. Ed. by Douglas Taylor. Dunlap Society Publications, Ser. 2, Vol. III. 1897.
- MARBURY, ELIZABETH, *My Crystal Ball*. 1923.
- MATTHEWS, BRANDER, and HUTTON, LAURENCE, *Actors and Actresses of Great Britain and the United States from the Days of David Garrick to the Present Time*. 1886.
- MORRIS, CLARA, *Life on the Stage. My Personal Experiences and Recollections*. 1902.
- MOSES, M. J., *Famous Actor-Families in America*. c. 1906.
- MURDOCH, JAMES E., *The Stage, or Recollections of Actors and Acting from an Experience of Fifty Years*. Philadelphia, 1880.
- RYAN, KATE, *Old Boston Museum Days*. Boston, 1915.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- SKINNER, OTIS, *Footlights and Spotlights*. Indianapolis, 1924.
- SOTHERN, EDWARD H., *The Melancholy Tale of Me. My Remembrances*. 1916.
- STODDART, J. H., *Recollections of a Player*. 1902.
- STRANG, LEWIS C., *Famous Actors of To-day in America*. Boston, 1900.
- WALLACK, LESTER, *Memories of Fifty Years*. 1889.
- Francis Wilson's *Life of Himself*. Boston, 1924.
- WILSTACH, PAUL, *Richard Mansfield, the Man and the Actor*. 1909.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *The Jeffersons*. Boston, 1881.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *A Sketch of the Life of John Gilbert*. Dunlap Society Publications, Ser. 1, Vol. II. 1890.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *Ada Rehan, A Study*. 2 Vols. 1891.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *Other Days; Being Chronicles and Memories of the Stage*. 1908.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *Life and Art of Richard Mansfield*. 2 Vols. 1910.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *Vagrant Memories*. 1915.
- WINTER, WILLIAM, *The Life of David Belasco*. 2 Vols. 1918.
- WOOLLCOTT, ALEXANDER, *Mrs. Fiske. Her Views on Actors, Acting and the Problems of Production*. 1917.

COLLECTIONS OF AMERICAN PLAYS

IN THE ORDER OF PUBLICATION

- REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN PLAYS. Edited by Arthur Hobson Quinn. The Century Company, 1917. Contains twenty-seven plays. Plays of this period are: Steele MacKaye's *Hazel Kirke*; Howard's *Shenandoah*; Gillette's *Secret Service*; *Madame Butterfly*, by Belasco and Long; Fitch's *Her Great Match*; Mitchell's *The New York Idea*; Thomas's *The Witching Hour*; Moody's *The Faith Healer*; Percy MacKaye's *The Scarecrow*; Sheldon's *The Boss*; Miss Crothers' *He and She*; O'Neill's *Beyond the Horizon*; Miss Vollmer's *Sun-Up*. (Revised edition, 1925).
- REPRESENTATIVE ONE-ACT PLAYS BY AMERICAN AUTHORS. Edited by Margaret G. Mayorga. Little, Brown & Co., 1919. Contains twenty-four one-act plays.
- MODERN AMERICAN PLAYS. Edited by George Pierce Baker. Harcourt, Brace & Howe, 1920. Contains Thomas's *As A Man Thinks*; Belasco's *The Return of Peter Grimm*; Edward Sheldon's

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Romance; Anspacher's *The Unchastened Woman*; and Massey's *Plots and Playwrights*.

REPRESENTATIVE PLAYS BY AMERICAN DRAMATISTS. Edited by Montrose J. Moses. E. P. Dutton & Co., Vol. III, 1921. Plays of this period are: MacKaye's *Paul Keweenaw*; Howard's *Shenandoah*; Thomas's *In Mizzoura*; Fitch's *The Moth and the Flame*; Mitchell's *The New York Idea*; Walter's *The Easiest Way*; and Belasco's *The Return of Peter Grimm*.

TWENTY CONTEMPORARY ONE-ACT PLAYS (American). Edited by Frank Shay. 1921 (Revised edition, 1922).

LONGER PLAYS BY MODERN AUTHORS (American). Edited by Helen L. Cohen. Harcourt & Brace, 1922. Contains Fitch's *Beau Brummell*; Thomas's *The Copperhead*; Kaufman and Connelly's *Dulcy*; and Tarkington's *The Intimate Strangers*.

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN PLAYS. Edited by Arthur Hobson Quinn. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923. Contains: Jesse Lynch Williams' *Why Marry?*; Eugene O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*; Rachel Crothers' *Nice People*; Gilbert Emery's *The Hero*; *To The Ladies!* by George S. Kaufman and Marc Connelly.

ONE-ACT PLAYS FOR STAGE AND STUDY. [Chiefly American.] Samuel French. First Series, 1924; Second Series, 1925; Third Series, 1927.

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN DRAMAS. NATIONAL AND LOCAL. Ed. by Montrose J. Moses. Little, Brown & Co., 1925. Contains: Charles H. Hoyt's *A Texas Steer*; David Belasco's *The Girl of the Golden West*; Augustus Thomas's *The Witching Hour*; Clyde Fitch's *The City*; Percy MacKaye's *The Scarecrow*; Josephine Preston Peabody's *The Piper*; Harry James Smith's *Mrs. Bumpstead-Leigh*; *It Pays to Advertise* by Roi Cooper Megrue and Walter Hackett; James Forbes' *The Famous Mrs. Fair*; Eugene O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones*; Rachel Crothers' *Nice People*; Owen Davis's *The Detour*; *Dulcy* by George S. Kaufman and Marc Connelly; Elmer L. Rice's *The Adding Machine*; George Kelly's *The Show-Off*.

Among many collections of One-Act Plays the following will represent the amateur and semi-professional drama.

PLAYS OF THE HARVARD DRAMATIC CLUB. Cambridge. c. 1912.

WISCONSIN PLAYS. Edited by T. H. Dickinson. First Series, 1914; Second Series, 1918.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- PROVINCETOWN PLAYS. [Edited by FRANK SHAY]. 6 Vols. 1916-18.
PLAYS OF THE 47 WORK SHOP. Edited by George P. Baker. Vols.
I-IV. 1918-25.
GROVE PLAYS OF THE BOHEMIAN CLUB. Edited by Porter Garnett.
3 Vols. San Francisco, 1918.
CAROLINA FOLK-PLAYS. Edited by Frederick H. Koch, 1922;
Second Series, 1924.

PLAY LIST

INDIVIDUAL AUTHORS

An asterisk (*) indicates a one-act play.

ABBOTT, GEORGE

BROADWAY. With Philip Dunning, q.v.

ADE, GEORGE

THE SULTAN OF SULU. 1903. (Studebaker Theatre, Chicago,
March 11, 1902)

PEGGY FROM PARIS. (Wallack's Theatre, Sept. 10, 1903)

THE COUNTY CHAIRMAN. c. 1924. (Wallack's Theatre, Nov.
24, 1903)

THE COLLEGE WIDOW. c. 1924. (Garden Theatre, Sept. 20,
1904)

THE SHO-GUN. (Wallack's Theatre, Oct. 10, 1904)

THE BAD SAMARITAN. (Garden Theatre, Sept. 12, 1905)

JUST OUT OF COLLEGE. c. 1924. (Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 27,
1905)

ARTIE. (Garrick Theatre, Oct. 28, 1907)

FATHER AND THE BOYS. c. 1924. (Empire Theatre, March 2,
1908)

THE FAIR CO-ED. (Knickerbocker Theatre, Feb. 1, 1909)

* MARSE COVINGTON. c. 1923.

* NETTIE. c. 1924. (Princess Theatre, Nov. 24, 1914)

* SPEAKING TO FATHER. c. 1923. [Abridged form of JUST OUT
OF COLLEGE]

* THE MAYOR AND THE MANICURE. c. 1923.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

AKINS, ZOË

- * THE MAGICAL CITY. *Forum*, May, 1916. (Comedy Theatre, March 20, 1916)
- PAPA. 1913. (Little Theatre, Los Angeles, Calif., Nov. 16, 1916; Little Theatre, N. Y., April 10, 1919)
- DÉCLASSÉE. 1923. (Empire Theatre, Oct. 6, 1919)
- FOOT-LOOSE. Adap. of FORGET ME NOT by H. C. Merivale and F. C. Groves. (Greenwich Village Theatre, May 10, 1920)
- DADDY'S GONE A-HUNTING. 1923. (Plymouth Theatre, Aug. 31, 1921)
- THE VARYING SHORE. (Hudson Theatre, Dec. 5, 1921)
- GREATNESS. 1923. (As THE TEXAS NIGHTINGALE, Empire Theatre, Nov. 20, 1922)
- A ROYAL FANDANGO. (Plymouth Theatre, Nov. 12, 1923)
- * SUCH A CHARMING YOUNG MAN. In *One-Act Plays for Stage and Study*. 1924.
- PARDON MY GLOVE. (Lyceum, Rochester, May 17, 1926)
- FIRST LOVE. Adap. of PILE OU FACE by Louis Verneuil. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Sept. 13, 1926)
- THOU DESPERATE PILOT. (Werba's Theatre, Brooklyn, Feb. 28, 1927)

ALDRICH, THOMAS BAILEY

- MERCEDES. Boston, 1884. (Palmer's Theatre, May 1, 1893)
- JUDITH OF BETHULIA. Boston, 1904. (Tremont Theatre, Boston, October 13, 1904; Daly's Theatre, December 5, 1904)

Biographical and Critical

- Aldrich, Mrs. Thomas Bailey, *Crowding Memories*. Boston, 1920.

ANDERSON, MAXWELL

- WHITE DESERT. (Princess Theatre, October 15, 1923)
- WHAT PRICE GLORY. With Laurence Stallings. In *Three Plays*. 1926. (Plymouth Theatre, September 3, 1924)
- FIRST FLIGHT. With Laurence Stallings. In *Three Plays*, 1926, (Plymouth Theatre, September 17, 1925)
- OUTSIDE LOOKING IN. (Greenwich Village Theatre, September 7, 1925)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

THE BUCCANEER. With Laurence Stallings. In *Three Plays*, 1926. (Plymouth Theatre, October 2, 1925)

SATURDAY'S CHILDREN. (Booth Theatre, January 26, 1927)

ANSPACHER, LOUIS KAUFMAN

THE EMBARRASSMENT OF RICHES. (Wallack's Theatre, May 14, 1906)

TRISTAN AND ISOLDE. 1914.

OUR CHILDREN. (New Haven, Sept. 6, 1915)

THE UNCHASTENED WOMAN. 1916. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Oct. 9, 1915)

ARMSTRONG, PAUL

THE HEIR TO THE HOORAH. (Hudson Theatre, Apr. 10, 1905)

SALOMY JANE. Dram. of Bret Harte's story. (Liberty Theatre, Jan. 19, 1907)

ALIAS JIMMY VALENTINE. Dram. of *A Retrieved Reformation*, by O. Henry. (Studebaker Theatre, Chicago, Dec. 25, 1909)

THE DEEP PURPLE. (Shubert's Theatre, Rochester, Sept. 26, 1910)

ARTHUR, JOSEPH

THE STILL ALARM. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, Aug. 30, 1887)

BLUE JEANS. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, Oct. 6, 1891)

THE CHERRY PICKERS. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, Oct. 12, 1896)

THE LOST RIVER. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, Oct. 3, 1900)

AUSTIN, MARY

THE ARROW MAKER. 1911. (New Theatre, Feb. 27, 1911)

BACON, FRANK

LIGHTNIN'. With Winchell Smith. c. 1918. (Gaiety Theatre, Aug. 26, 1918)

FIVE O'CLOCK. (Fulton Theatre, Oct. 13, 1919)

BAKER, GEORGE PIERCE

THE PILGRIM SPIRIT. Boston, c. 1921. (Plymouth, Mass., July 13, 1921)

BARNARD, CHARLES

THE COUNTY FAIR. With Neil Burgess. Priv. Printed. 1889. (Proctor's Twenty-third St. Theatre, March 5, 1889)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

BARRY, PHILIP

- YOU AND I. 1925. (Belmont Theatre, Feb. 19, 1923)
THE YOUNGEST. 1925. (Gaiety Theatre, Dec. 22, 1924)
IN A GARDEN. 1926. (Plymouth Theatre, Nov. 16, 1925)
WHITE WINGS. 1927. (Booth Theatre, Oct. 15, 1926)

BEACH, LEWIS

- A SQUARE PEG. Boston, 1924. (Punch and Judy Theatre, Jan. 27, 1923)
THE GOOSE HANGS HIGH. Boston, 1924. (Bijou Theatre, Jan. 29, 1924)
ANN VROOME. Boston, 1924.

BELASCO, DAVID

The following plays were produced in California before 1872:
JIM BLACK; OR, THE REGULATOR'S REVENGE, THE ROLL OF THE DRUM, SPIRITLAND, THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, THE HANGING OF NATHAN HALE, THE DYING BOY'S LAST CHRISTMAS, ADAM AND EVE IN THE GARDEN OF EDEN, THE BUTCHER'S REVENGE; OR, THE SEVEN BUCKETS OF BLOOD, AN ANGEL IN HELL, THE BRONZE STATUE, ALADDIN AND THE WONDERFUL LAMP.

- SYLVIA'S LOVERS. (Piper's Opera House, Virginia City, 1875?)
THE DOLL MASTER. (Sacramento Theatre, Sacramento, 1874-5?)
THE CREOLE. Adap. of ARTICLE 47. (California, 1876-7; Union Square Theatre, Jan. 17, 1881)
THE HAUNTED HOUSE. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 16, 1877)
THE MYSTERIOUS INN. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 16, 1877)
A STORM OF THOUGHTS. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 17, 1877)
THE PERSECUTED TRAVELLER. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 17, 1877)
OUR MYSTERIOUS BOARDING HOUSE. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 20, 1877)
THE PRODIGAL'S RETURN. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, April 2, 1877)
WINE, WOMEN AND CARDS. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb.-May, 1877)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- THE CHRISTMAS NIGHT; OR, THE CONVICT'S RETURN. (Egyptian Hall, San Francisco, Feb.-May, 1877)
- OLIVIA. Dram. of *The Vicar of Wakefield*. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Sept. 2, 1878)
- NOT GUILTY. Adap. of Watts Phillips's play of same name. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Dec. 25, 1878)
- WITHIN AN INCH OF HIS LIFE. With James A. Herne. Dram. of story by Gaboriau. (Grand Opera House, San Francisco, Feb. 17, 1879)
- THE MILLIONAIRE'S DAUGHTER. Based on THE BANKER'S DAUGHTER. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, May 19, 1879)
- MARRIAGE BY MOONLIGHT, afterwards HAP-HAZARD. With James A. Herne. MS. Adap. of Watts Phillips's CAMELLIA'S HUSBAND. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, June 30, 1879)
- DRINK. Dram. of Zola's novel, *L'Assommoir*. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, July 15, 1879)
- HEARTS OF OAK. With James A. Herne. MS. (As CHUMS, Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Sept. 9, 1879; as HEARTS OF OAK, Hamlin's Theatre, Chicago, Nov. 17, 1879)
- PAUL ARNIFF; OR, THE LOVE OF A SERF. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, July 19, 1880)
- TRUE TO THE CORE. Adap. of T. P. Cooke's play of same name. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Aug. 30, 1880)
- THE EVICTION. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Jan. 10, 1881)
- LA BELLE RUSSE. Adap. of FORGET-ME-NOT by Merivale and Groves and THE NEW MAGDALEN by Wilkie Collins. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, July 18, 1881; Wallack's Theatre, May 8, 1882; Pavilion Theatre, London, April 17, 1886)
- THE STRANGLERS OF PARIS. Dram. of *Les Etrangleurs de Paris*, by Adolphe Belot. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Aug. 15, 1881; Park Theatre, Nov. 12, 1883)
- THE LONE PINE. (Sacramento Theatre, Sacramento, before 1882)
- THE CURSE OF CAIN. With Peter Robertson. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, March 7, 1882)
- AMERICAN BORN. Adap. from BRITISH BORN by Paul Merritt

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- and Henry Pettitt. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, July 10, 1882)
- MAY BLOSSOM. c. 1882. (Madison Square Theatre, April 12, 1884)
- VALERIE. Adap. of Sardou's FERNANDE. (Wallack's Theatre, Feb. 15, 1886)
- THE HIGHEST BIDDER. Adap. of TRADE by J. M. Morton and R. Reece. (Lyceum Theatre, May 3, 1887)
- PAWN TICKET NO. 210. With Clay M. Greene. (McVicker's Theatre, Chicago, Sept. 12, 1887)
- THE WIFE. With Henry C. DeMille. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Nov. 1, 1887; as THE SENATOR'S WIFE, Theatre Royal, Manchester, Sept. 30, 1892)
- LORD CHUMLEY. With Henry C. DeMille. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Aug. 21, 1888)
- THE CHARITY BALL. With Henry C. DeMille. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Nov. 19, 1889)
- MEN AND WOMEN. With Henry C. DeMille. MS. (Proctor's Twenty-third St. Theatre, Oct. 21, 1890; Opera Comique, London, March 5, 1893)
- MISS HELYETT. Adap. from the French of Maxime Boucheron. (Star Theatre, Nov. 3, 1891)
- THE GIRL I LEFT BEHIND ME. With Franklyn Fyles. MS. (Empire Theatre, Jan. 25, 1893; Sadler's Wells Theatre, London, Jan. 6, 1893)
- THE YOUNGER SON. Adap. of SCHLIMME SAAT, by O. Vischer. (Empire Theatre, Oct. 24, 1893)
- THE HEART OF MARYLAND. MS. (Grand Opera House, Washington, D. C., Oct. 9, 1895; Herald Square Theatre, Oct. 22, 1895)
- UNDER THE POLAR STAR. With Clay M. Greene. (Academy of Music, Aug. 20, 1896; earlier form in California, 1875-8)
- ZAZA. From the French of Pierre Berton and Charles Simon. (Lafayette Opera House, Washington, D. C., Dec. 25, 1898; Garrick Theatre, Jan. 9, 1899)
- NAUGHTY ANTHONY. MS. (Columbia Theatre, Washington, D. C., Dec. 25, 1899; Herald Square Theatre, Jan. 8, 1900)
- MADAME BUTTERFLY. With John Luther Long, from story by Long. In *Quinn's Representative American Plays*. (Herald

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- Square Theatre, Mar. 5, 1900; Duke of York's Theatre, London, April 28, 1900)
- DU BARRY. (New National Theatre, Washington, D. C., Dec. 12, 1901; Criterion Theatre, Dec. 25, 1901)
- THE DARLING OF THE GODS. With John Luther Long. MS. (New National Theatre, Washington, D. C., Nov. 17, 1902; Belasco Theatre, now Republic, Dec. 3, 1902; Theater des Westens, Berlin, May, 1903; His Majesty's Theatre, London, Dec. 28, 1903)
- SWEET KITTY BELLAIRS. Adap. of THE BATH COMEDY by A. and E. Castle. (Lafayette Opera House, Washington, D. C., Nov. 23, 1903; Belasco Theatre, now Republic, Dec. 12, 1903; Haymarket Theatre, London, Oct. 5, 1907)
- ADREA. With John Luther Long. MS. (Convention Hall, Washington, D. C., Dec. 26, 1904; Belasco Theatre, now Republic, Jan. 11, 1905)
- THE GIRL OF THE GOLDEN WEST. In Moses's *Representative American Dramas*. (Belasco Theatre, Pittsburgh, Oct. 3, 1905; Belasco Theatre, now Republic, Nov. 14, 1905)
- THE ROSE OF THE RANCHO. With Richard Walton Tully. MS. (Majestic Theatre, Boston, Nov. 12, 1906; Belasco Theatre, now Republic, Nov. 27, 1906)
- A GRAND ARMY MAN. With Pauline Phelps and Marion Short. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Sept. 23, 1907; Stuyvesant Theatre, now Belasco, Oct. 16, 1907)
- THE LILY. From the French of Pierre Wolff and Gaston Leroux. (Belasco Theatre, Washington, D. C., Dec. 6, 1909; Stuyvesant Theatre, now Belasco, Dec. 23, 1909; Kingsway Theatre, London, Feb. 23, 1911)
- THE RETURN OF PETER GRIMM. In Baker's *Modern American Plays*. (Hollis Street Theatre, Boston, Jan. 2, 1911; Belasco Theatre, Oct. 17, 1911)
- THE GOVERNOR'S LADY. With Alice Bradley. (Broad Street Theatre, Phila., April 29, 1912; Republic Theatre, Sept. 9, 1912)
- THE SECRET. From the French of Henri Bernstein. (Belasco Theatre, Dec. 23, 1913)
- VAN DER DECKEN. (The Playhouse, Wilmington, Del., Dec. 12, 1915)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- THE SON DAUGHTER. With George Scarborough. (Ford's Opera House, Baltimore, Nov. 4, 1919; Belasco Theatre, Nov. 19, 1919)
- KIKI. Adap. of KIKI by André Picard. (Apollo Theatre, Atlantic City, N. J., July 25, 1921; Belasco Theatre, Nov. 29, 1921)
- THE COMEDIAN. Adap. from the French of Sacha Guitry. (Playhouse, Wilmington, Del., Jan. 26, 1923; Lyceum Theatre, March 13, 1923)
- LAUGH, CLOWN, LAUGH. Adap. by Belasco and Tom Cushing of RIDI PAGLIACCIO, by Fausto Martini. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Rochester, Oct. 18, 1923; Belasco Theatre, Nov. 28, 1923)

Biographical and Critical

- Belasco, David, *The Theatre Through the Stage Door*. Ed. by L. V. DeFoe. 1919.
- Belasco, David, *A Souvenir of Shakespeare's The Merchant of Venice, as presented by David Belasco, at the Lyceum Theatre, Dec. 21, 1922*. Priv. printed, 1923.
- Belasco, David, *Plays Produced under the Stage Direction of David Belasco*. Priv. printed, 1925.
- Winter, William, *The Life of David Belasco*. 2 Vols. 1918. [This is the standard biography. Belasco's "My Life Story," printed in *Hearst's Magazine*, beginning March, 1914, and not published in book form, is interesting but inaccurate.]
- Dransfield, Jane, "Behind the Scenes with Belasco," *Theatre Magazine*. XXXV (April, 1922), 228-230; 260.
- Huneker, James G., "David Belasco," *The Outlook*, CXXVII (March 16, 1921), 418-422.
- Reichert, Edwin Tyson, "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and The Case of Becky as staged by Mr. David Belasco." *Public Lectures of the University of Pennsylvania*, Phila., 1915.

BENRIMO, J. HARRY

- THE YELLOW JACKET. With G. C. Hazelton, q. v.
- THE WILLOW TREE. With Harrison Rhodes. (Cohan and Harris Theatre, March 6, 1917)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

BROADHURST, GEORGE

- THE SPECULATOR. (Fifth Avenue Theatre, April 18, 1896)
WHAT HAPPENED TO JONES. c. 1910. (Manhattan Theatre, Aug. 30, 1897)
THE WRONG MR. WRIGHT. (Bijou Theatre, Sept. 6, 1897)
THE LAST CHAPTER. (Garden Theatre, March 6, 1899)
WHY SMITH LEFT HOME. c. 1912. (Hoyt's Theatre, Sept. 2, 1899)
THE HOUSE THAT JACK BUILT. (Hoyt's Theatre, Dec. 24, 1900)
AN AMERICAN LORD. With C. T. Dazey. (Hudson Theatre, April 23, 1906)
THE MAN OF THE HOUR. c. 1916. (Savoy Theatre, Dec. 4, 1906)
THE MILLS OF THE GODS. (Astor Theatre, March 4, 1907)
THE EASTERNER. (Garrick Theatre, March 2, 1908)
WILDFIRE. With George V. Hobart. (Liberty Theatre, Sept. 7, 1908)
THE DOLLAR MARK. (Wallack's Theatre, Aug. 23, 1909)
BOUGHT AND PAID FOR. c. 1916. (Playhouse, Sept. 26, 1911)
THE PRICE. MS. (Hudson Theatre, Nov. 1, 1911)
TO-DAY. Adap. from Yiddish of A. S. Schomer. (Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Oct. 6, 1913)
THE LAW OF THE LAND. (Harmanus Bleecker Hall, Albany, Sept. 21, 1914; Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Sept. 30, 1914)

BROWN, ALICE

- CHILDREN OF EARTH. 1915. (Booth Theatre, Jan. 12, 1915)
One-act Plays. 1921.
CHARLES LAMB. 1924.

BROWNE, PORTER EMERSON

- A FOOL THERE WAS. (Liberty Theatre, March 24, 1909)
THE BAD MAN. c. 1926. (Comedy Theatre, Aug. 30, 1920)

BUCHANAN, THOMPSON

- A WOMAN'S WAY. 1915. (Davidson Theatre, Milwaukee, Jan. 7, 1909; Hackett Theatre, Feb. 22, 1909)
THE CUB. (Comedy Theatre, Nov. 1, 1910)
LIFE. (Manhattan Opear House, Oct. 24, 1914)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

CIVILIAN CLOTHES. New York, n. d. (Morosco Theatre, Sept. 12, 1919)

THE SPORTING THING TO DO. (Ritz Theatre, Feb. 19, 1923)

SINNER. (Klaw Theatre, Feb. 7, 1927)

BURGESS, NEIL

THE COUNTY FAIR. With Charles Barnard, q. v.

BURNETT, FRANCES HODGSON

ESMERALDA. With William Gillette, q. v.

LITTLE LORD FAUNTLEROY. Dram. of novel of same name. 1889.
(Terry's Theatre, London, May 14, 1888; Boston Museum, Oct. 10, 1888)

THE FIRST GENTLEMAN OF EUROPE. With George Fleming.
(Lyceum Theatre, Jan. 25, 1897)

A LADY OF QUALITY. With Stephen Townsend. Dram. novel
of same name. (Wallack's Theatre, Nov. 1, 1897)

THE PRETTY SISTER OF JOSÉ. Dram. novel of same name.
(Empire Theatre, Nov. 10, 1903)

THE DAWN OF A TO-MORROW. (Academy of Music, Norfolk,
Va., Dec. 18, 1908; Lyceum Theatre, Jan. 25, 1909)

THE LITTLE PRINCESS. 1911.

CALHOUN, ALFRED ROCHEFORT

THE COLOR GUARD. Pittsburgh, 1870. (California Theatre,
San Francisco, Sept. 22, 1879. Prob. not first)

CAMPBELL, BARTLEY

THROUGH FIRE. (Pittsburgh, 1871)

PERIL; OR, LOVE AT LONG BRANCH. (Chestnut St. Theatre,
Phila., 1872; Union Square Theatre, June 22, 1875)

FATE. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, 1872-3; Wallack's Theatre,
June, 1874; Gaiety Theatre, Glasgow, Feb. 21, 1876; Gaiety
Theatre, London, Aug. 6, 1884)

RISKS; OR, INSURE YOUR LIFE. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago,
April, 1873; Park Theatre, Jan. 14, 1878)

THE VIRGINIAN. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, Sept., 1873; St.
James's Theatre, London, Nov. 20, 1876)

GRAN UALE. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, 1874)

BULLS AND BEARS. Adap. of ULTIMO, by Gustav von Moser.
(Maguire's Opera House, San Francisco, Summer, 1875)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- ON THE RHINE. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, 1875?)
- A HEROINE IN RAGS. (Arch St. Theatre, Phila., 1876)
- HEARTS. (Arch St. Theatre, Phila., 1876-7?)
- HOW WOMEN LOVE; OR, THE HEART OF THE SIERRAS. (Arch St. Theatre, Phila., May, 1877). Rewritten as THE VIGILANTES.
- CLIO. (McVicker's Theatre, Chicago, 1878; Elephant and Camel Theatre, London, Aug. 14, 1885 [copyright]; Niblo's Garden, Aug. 17, 1885)
- MY PARTNER. MS. (Union Square Theatre, Sept. 16, 1879; Olympic Theatre, London, April 10, 1884; Residenz Theater, Berlin, Sept. 15, 1884)
- THE GALLEY SLAVE. MS. (Chestnut St. Theatre, Phila., Sept. 29, 1879; Theatre Royal, Hull, England, Nov. 22, 1880; Grand Theatre, London, Feb. 8, 1886)
- FAIRFAX. MS. (Park Theatre, Boston, Dec. 8, 1879; Park Theatre, Dec. 29, 1879)
- MATRIMONY. Revision of PERIL. (Standard Theatre, Dec. 6, 1880)
- MY GERALDINE. (Standard Theatre, Dec. 21, 1880)
- THE WHITE SLAVE. MS. (Haverley's Theatre, April 3, 1882; Grand Theatre, London, Aug. 18, 1884)
- FRIEND AND FOE. Revision of ON THE RHINE. (Windsor Theatre, Oct. 16, 1882)
- SIBERIA. MS. (California Theatre, San Francisco, Nov. 26, 1882; Haverley's Fourteenth St. Theatre, Feb. 26, 1883; Princess's Theatre, London, Dec. 14, 1887)
- SEPARATION. MS. (Union Square Theatre, Jan. 28, 1884)
- PAQUITA. (Bartley Campbell's Fourteenth St. Theatre, Aug. 31, 1885)

Biographical and Critical

- M[ontgomery], G. E., "Bartley Campbell," *The Theatre*, I (1886), 348-9.

CARB, DAVID

- QUEEN VICTORIA. With W. P. Eaton. c. 1923. (Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Nov. 15, 1923)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

CARLETON, HENRY GUY

MEMNON. Priv. printed, Chicago, 1881

VICTOR DURAND. MS. (Wallack's Theatre, Dec. 18, 1884)

YE EARLIE TROUBLE. (Proctor's Theatre, Sept. 10, 1892)

THE LION'S MOUTH. (Star Theatre, Sept. 11, 1892)

A GILDED FOOL. (Miner's Fifth Avenue Theatre, Nov. 7, 1892)

THE BUTTERFLIES. 1894. (Palmer's Theatre, Feb. 5, 1894)

LEM KETTLE. (Bijou Theatre, Sept. 24, 1894)

THAT IMPRUDENT YOUNG COUPLE. (Empire Theatre, Sept. 23, 1895)

AMBITION. (Miner's Fifth Ave. Theatre, Oct. 22, 1895)

COLINETTE. Adap. from French of Lenôtre and Martin. (Knickerbocker Theatre, April 10, 1899)

CARPENTER, EDWARD CHILDS

THE DRAGON FLY. With John Luther Long. (Garrick Theatre, Phila. 1905)

CAPTAIN COURTESY. (Belasco Theatre, Los Angeles, 1906)

THE BARBER OF NEW ORLEANS. Priv. printed. (Garrick Theatre, Chicago, Oct. 19, 1908; Daly's Theatre, Jan. 5, 1909)

THE CHALLENGE. (Parson's Theatre, Hartford, Conn., Oct. 26, 1911)

THE TONGUES OF MEN. c. 1926. (English's Theatre, Indianapolis, Oct. 27, 1913; Harris Theatre, Nov. 10, 1913)

THE CINDERELLA MAN, c. 1915. (Hudson Theatre, Jan. 17, 1916; Queen's Theatre, London, 1919)

THE PIPES OF PAN, c. 1926. (Hudson Theatre, Nov. 6, 1917)

THREE BEARS. c. 1926. (Empire Theatre, Nov. 13, 1917)

BAB. Dram. novel by Mary R. Rinehart, c. 1919. (Hollis St. Theatre, Boston, Feb. 16, 1920; Park Theatre, Oct. 18, 1920)

POT LUCK. MS. (Comedy Theatre, Sept. 29, 1921)

CONNIE GOES HOME. MS. (Forty-ninth St. Theatre, Sept. 6, 1923)

CHURCHILL, WINSTON

THE TITLE MART. 1905. (Madison Square Theatre, Feb. 19, 1906)

THE CRISIS. c. 1927.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

COHAN, GEORGE M.

- THE GOVERNOR'S SON. (Savoy Theatre, Feb. 25, 1901)
- RUNNING FOR OFFICE. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, April 27, 1903)
- LITTLE JOHNNY JONES. (Liberty Theatre, Nov. 7, 1904)
- FORTY-FIVE MINUTES FROM BROADWAY. MS. (New Amsterdam Theatre, Jan. 1, 1906)
- GEORGE WASHINGTON, JR. (Herald Square Theatre, Feb. 12, 1906)
- POPULARITY. (Wallack's Theatre, Oct. 1, 1906)
- FIFTY MILES FROM BOSTON. (Garriek Theatre, Feb. 3, 1907)
- THE TALK OF NEW YORK. (Knickerbocker Theatre, Dec. 3, 1907)
- THE YANKEE PRINCE. (Knickerbocker Theatre, April 20, 1908)
- THE AMERICAN IDEA. (New York Theatre, Oct. 5, 1908)
- GET RICH QUICK WALLINGFORD. Dram. of story by George Randolph Chester, MS. (Gaiety Theatre, Sept. 19, 1910; Queen's Theatre, London, Jan. 14, 1913)
- THE LITTLE MILLIONAIRE. (Cohan Theatre, Sept. 22, 1911)
- BROADWAY JONES. c. 1923. (Parson's Theatre, Hartford, Conn., Sept. 16, 1912; Cohan Theatre, Sept. 23, 1912)
- SEVEN KEYS TO BALDPATE. Priv. printed, 1914. Dram. of story by Earl Biggers. (Astor Theatre, Sept. 22, 1913)
- THE MIRACLE MAN. Dram. of story by Frank L. Packard. (Astor Theatre, Sept. 21, 1914)
- HIT THE TRAIL HOLLIDAY. Priv. printed, 1916. (Astor Theatre, Sept. 13, 1915)
- THE TAVERN. With Cora D. Gannt. (Cohan Theatre, Sept. 27, 1920)
- A PRINCE THERE WAS. Dram. of *Enchanted Hearts* by Darragh Aldrich, MS. (Apollo Theatre, Atlantic City, N. J., Oct. 31, 1918; Cohan Theatre, Dec. 24, 1918)
- MADELEINE AND THE MOVIES. (Gaiety Theatre, March 6, 1922)
- THE SONG AND DANCE MAN. (Garriek Theatre, Phila., Nov. 19, 1923; Hudson Theatre, Dec. 31, 1923)
- AMERICAN BORN. (Hudson Theatre, Oct. 5, 1925)
- THE HOME-TOWNERS. (Chicago, 1926; Hudson Theatre, Aug. 23, 1926)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Biographical and Critical

Cohan, George M., *Twenty Years on Broadway and the Years it Took to Get There.* c. 1925.

Anon. "Get Rich Quick Wallingford. A Racy Satire of American Commercialism." *Current Literature*, *LI* (Aug., 1911), 185-191.

CONNELLY, MARC[US COOK]

DULCY. With G. S. Kaufman, q. v.

TO THE LADIES. With G. S. Kaufman, q. v.

MERTON OF THE MOVIES. With G. S. Kaufman, q. v.

THE DEEP TANGLED WILDWOOD. With G. S. Kaufman, q. v.

BEGGAR ON HORSEBACK. With G. S. Kaufman, q. v.

THE WISDOM TOOTH. 1926. (Little Theatre, Feb. 15, 1926)

CRAVEN, FRANK

TOO MANY COOKS. c. 1927. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Feb. 24, 1914)

THIS WAY OUT. (Cohan Theatre, Aug. 30, 1917)

THE FIRST YEAR. New York, n. d. (Ford's Opera House, Baltimore, Oct. 11, 1920; Little Theatre, Oct. 20, 1920)

SPITE CORNER. c. 1923. (Little Theatre, Sept. 25, 1922)

NEW BROOMS. (Fulton Theatre, Nov. 17, 1924)

CRAWFORD, FRANCIS MARION

DR. CLAUDIUS. With Harry St. Maur. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Feb. 1, 1897)

IN THE PALACE OF THE KING. With Lorimer Stoddard. Printed in abstract, 1909. (Republic Theatre, Dec. 31, 1901)

FRANCESCA DA RIMINI. London, 1902.

THE WHITE SISTER. With Walter Hackett. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Sept. 27, 1909)

CROTHERS, RACHEL

* THE RECTOR. c. 1905. (Madison Square Theatre, April 3, 1902)

THE THREE OF US. c. 1916. (Madison Square Theatre, Oct. 17, 1906)

THE COMING OF MRS. PATRICK. (Madison Square Theatre, Nov. 6, 1907)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- MYSELF BETTINA. (Powers Theatre, Chicago, Jan. 1908; Daly's Theatre, Oct. 5, 1908)
- * KATY DID. In *The Smart Set*. Jan., 1909.
- * MRS. MOLLY. In *The Smart Set*. March, 1909.
- A MAN'S WORLD. Boston, 1915. (National Theatre, Washington, D. C., Oct. 18, 1909; Comedy Theatre, Feb. 8, 1910)
- HE AND SHE. In Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Poughkeepsie, 1911; Plymouth Theatre, Boston, Feb. 5, 1912, as THE HERFORDS; Little Theatre, Feb. 12, 1920 as HE AND SHE)
- OURSELVES. MS. (Lyric Theatre, Nov. 13, 1913)
- YOUNG WISDOM. (Criterion Theatre, Jan. 5, 1914)
- THE HEART OF PADDY WHACK. c. 1925. (Baltimore, Oct. 5, 1914; Grand Opera House, Nov. 26, 1914)
- OLD LADY 31. 1923. (Schenectady, N. Y., Sept. 4, 1916; Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Oct. 30, 1916)
- MOTHER CAREY'S CHICKENS. With Kate Douglas Wiggin. (Cort Theatre, Sept. 25, 1917)
- ONCE UPON A TIME. c. 1925. (Atlantic City, N. J., Oct., 1917; Fulton Theatre, April 15, 1918)
- A LITTLE JOURNEY. 1923. (Little Theatre, Dec. 26, 1918)
- 39 EAST. 1924. (Broadhurst Theatre, March 31, 1919)
- NICE PEOPLE. In Quinn's *Contemporary American Plays*. (Atlantic City, N. J., Dec. 26, 1920; Klaw Theatre, March 2, 1921)
- EVERYDAY. (Atlantic City, N. J., Oct. 27, 1921; Bijou Theatre, Nov. 16, 1921)
- MARY THE THIRD. 1923. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Feb. 5, 1923)
- EXPRESSING WILLIE. 1924. (Forty-eighth St. Theatre, April 16, 1924)
- A LADY'S VIRTUE. (Selwyn Theatre, Chicago, Oct., 1925; Bijou Theatre, Nov. 23, 1925)
- Six One-act Plays*. Boston, 1925. Contains THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING CLOTHED, THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING NICE, THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING MARRIED, THE IMPORTANCE OF BEING A WOMAN, WHAT THEY THINK, and PEGGY.

CUNNINGHAM, LEON

- HOSPITALITY. (Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Nov. 13, 1922)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

DALY, AUGUSTIN

In the following list of plays written or adapted by Daly, manuscripts are indicated only when no printed copies exist. MSS. are in possession of Samuel French.

LEAH THE FORSAKEN. Adap. of DEBORAH by S. H. von Mosen-thal, New York, n. d. (Howard Athenæum, Boston, Dec. 8, 1862; Niblo's Garden, Jan. 19, 1863; Adelphi Theatre, London, Oct. 1, 1863)

TAMING A BUTTERFLY. Adap. of LE PAPILLON by Sardou. Priv. printed, n. d. (Olympic Theatre, Feb. 25, 1864)

LORLIE'S WEDDING. Adap. of DORF UND STADT[?] MS. (Winter Garden, March 28, 1864)

JUDITH. With Paul Nicholson. MS. (Winter Garden, April 8, 1864)

THE SORCERESS. Adap. of LA SORCIÈRE[?] (Winter Garden, April 26, 1864)

GARCIA. (Winter Garden, 1864?)

LA TIREUSE DES CARTES. (Winter Garden, 1864?)

GRIFFITH GAUNT; OR, JEALOUSY. 1868. Dram. novel by Charles Reade. (New York Theatre, Nov. 7, 1866)

HAZARDOUS GROUND. Adap. of NOS BON VILLAGEOIS by Sardou. 1868. (Conway's Park Theatre, Brooklyn, March, 1867?)

UNDER THE GASLIGHT. 1867. (New York Theatre, August 12, 1867; Pavilion Theatre, London, July 20, 1868; adapted as LONDON BY GASLIGHT at Sadler's Wells Theatre, London, Sept. 19, 1868)

A LEGEND OF NORWOOD; OR, VILLAGE LIFE IN NEW ENGLAND. Dram. of novel by Henry Ward Beecher. Priv. printed, 1867. (New York Theatre, Nov. 10, 1867)

PICKWICK PAPERS. Dram. of novel by Dickens. Auto. MS. (New York Theatre, Jan. 22, 1868)

A FLASH OF LIGHTNING. Priv. printed, 1885. (Broadway Theatre, June 10, 1868; Grecian Theatre, London, Nov. 21, 1870)

THE RED SCARF. MS. (Conway's Park Theatre, Brooklyn, 1869?; Bowery Theatre, Nov. 1869)

SANYA; OR, THE RED RIBBON. (1869?) [Probably the play in MS. as RHODA]

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- COME HERE; OR, THE DÉBUTANTE'S TEST. MS. 1870. [Prepared for Janauschek's English Performance.]
- FROU-FROU. Adap. from Henri Meilhac and Ludovic Halévy. c. 1870. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Feb. 15, 1870)
- MAN AND WIFE. Dram. of novel by Wilkie Collins. MS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 13, 1870)
- HORIZON. Priv. printed, 1885. (Olympic Theatre, March 21, 1871)
- NO NAME. Dram. of novel by Wilkie Collins. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, June 7, 1871)
- DELMONICO'S; OR, LARKS UP THE HUDSON. Revision of TAMING A BUTTERFLY. MS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, June 20, 1871)
- DIVORCE. Priv. printed, 1884. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 5, 1871; Theatre Royal, Edinburgh, Dec. 12, 1881)
- ARTICLE 47. Adap. of L'ARTICLE 47 by Adolphe Belot. MS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, April 2, 1872)
- KING CARROT. Adap. of LE ROI CAROTTE by Sardou. Auto. MS. (Grand Opera House, Aug. 26, 1872)
- ALIXE. Adap. of LA COMTESSE DE SOMERIVE by Baroness de Prevois and Théodore Barrière. Auto. MS. (Daly's Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 21, 1873)
- ROUGHING IT. MS. (Grand Opera House, Feb. 18, 1873)
- MADELEINE MOREL. Adap. from German of S. H. von Mosen-thal. Priv. printed, 1884. (Daly's Fifth Ave. Theatre, May 20, 1873)
- OUR CITY. (Bowery Theatre, Nov. 17, 1873?)
- ROUND THE CLOCK. Adap. in part, of LA TOUR DU CADRAN, by Hector Crémieux and Henri Bocage. MS. (Grand Opera House, Nov. 24, 1873)
- FOLLINE. Adap. of LA MAISON NEUVE by Sardou. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 27, 1874)
- MONSIEUR ALPHONSE. Adap. from Alexandre Dumas, fils. Priv. printed, 1886. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, April 25, 1874)
- WHAT SHOULD SHE DO? OR, JEALOUSY. Adap. of GERMAINE by Edmond About. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre Aug. 25, 1874)
- THE TWO WIDOWS. Adap. of LES DEUX VEUVES by Felicien

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- MALLEFILLE. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Oct. 10, 1874)
- YORICK. Adap. of UN DRAMA NUEVO by Manuel Tamayo y Baus (Estabanez). Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Dec. 5, 1874)
- THE BIG BONANZA. Adap. of ULTIMO by Gustav von Moser. Priv. printed, 1884. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Feb. 17, 1875)
- PIQUE. Priv. printed, 1884. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Dec. 14, 1875; as ONLY A WOMAN, Brighton Theatre Royal, Oct. 16, 1882; as HER OWN ENEMY, Gaiety Theatre, London, March 26, 1884)
- LIFE. Adap. of LE PROCÈS VEAURADIEUX. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 27, 1876)
- THE AMERICAN. Adap. of L'ÉTRANGÈRE by Dumas, fils. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Dec. 20, 1876)
- LEMONS. Adap. of CITRONEN by Julius Rosen. Priv. printed, 1877. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 15, 1877)
- BLUE GLASS. Adap. of EPIDEMIC by Schweitzer. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, March 12, 1877)
- THE PRINCESS ROYAL. Adap. of L'OFFICIER DE FORTUNE by Jules Adenis and Jules Rostaing. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, March 31, 1877)
- VESTA. Adap. of ROME VAINCUE by Alexandre Parodi. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, May 28, 1877)
- THE DARK CITY. Auto. MS. (New Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 10, 1877)
- *LOVE'S YOUNG DREAM. "From the French." Priv. printed, n. d. (Daly's Theatre, Sept. 18, 1879)
- AN ARABIAN NIGHT; OR, HAROUN AL RASCHID AND HIS MOTHER-IN-LAW. Adap. of HARUN AL RASCHID by Gustav von Moser. Priv. printed, n. d. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 29, 1879)
- THE ROYAL MIDDY. With Fred Williams. Adap. of DER SEE-KADETT by Richard Genée. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Jan. 29, 1880)
- THE WAY WE LIVE. Adap. of DIE WOHLTHÄTIGEN FRAUEN by A. L'Arronge. MS. (Daly's Theatre, April 10, 1880)
- TIOTE. With Fred Williams. Adap. of LA PETIOTE by Maurice Drack. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Aug. 18, 1880)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- NEEDLES AND PINS. Adap. of STARKE MITTELN by Julius Rosen; Priv. printed, 1884. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 9, 1880; Crystal Palace, London, Aug. 12, 1884)
- ZANINA; OR, THE ROVER OF CAMBAYE. Adap. of NISIDA by R. Genée. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Jan. 18, 1881)
- ROYAL YOUTH. Adap. of LA JEUNESSE DE LOUIS XIV by Dumas père. MS. partly auto. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 22, 1881)
- THE PASSING REGIMENT. Adap. of KRIEG IM FRIEDEN by G. von Moser and F. von Schönthan. Priv. printed, 1884. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 10, 1881)
- ODETTE. Adap. from Sardou. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 6, 1882)
- OUR ENGLISH FRIEND. Adap. of REIF VON REIFLINGEN by G. von Moser. Priv. printed, 1884. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 25, 1882)
- SERGE PANINE. Adap. from Georges Olmet. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 1, 1883)
- SEVEN-TWENTY-EIGHT; OR, CASTING THE BOOMERANG. Adap. of DER SCHWABENSTREICH by Franz von Schönthan. Priv. printed, 1886; also pub. New York, n. d. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 24, 1883)
- DOLLARS AND SENSE; OR, THE HEEDLESS ONES. Adap. of DIE SORGLOSEN by Adolph L'Arronge. Priv. printed, 1885. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 2, 1883)
- RED LETTER NIGHTS. Adap. of EIN GEMACHTER MANN. By Jacobson. MS. (Daly's Theatre, March 12, 1884)
- A WOODEN SPOON; OR, PERDITA'S PENATES. Adap. of RODERICK HELLER by F. von Schönthan. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 7, 1884)
- LOVE ON CRUTCHES. Adap. of IHRE IDEALE by Heinrich Stopitzer. Priv. printed, 1884. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 25, 1884)
- * A WOMAN'S WONT. Adap. of GOTT SEI DANK, DER TISCH IST GEDECKT from DIEU MERCI, LE COUVERT EST MIS, by Leon Gozlan. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 28, 1885)
- A NIGHT OFF; OR, A PAGE FROM BALZAC. Adap. of DER RAUB DER SABINERINNEN by Franz and Paul von Schönthan. c. 1897. (Daly's Theatre, March 4, 1885)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- DENISE. Adap. from Dumas, fils. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, May 9, 1885)
- * A WET BLANKET. Adap. from French of Bilhaud and Levy. Priv. printed, n. d. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 13, 1886)
- * A SUDDEN SHOWER. From the French of Beissier. Priv. printed, n. d. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 18, 1886)
- NANCY AND COMPANY. Adap. of HALBE DICHTER by Julius Rosen. Priv. printed, 1884. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 24, 1886)
- AFTER BUSINESS HOURS. From German of Oscar Blumenthal. Priv. printed, 1886. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 5, 1886)
- LOVE IN HARNESS. Adap. of BONHEUR CONJUGAL by Albin Valabrégue. Priv. printed, 1887. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 16, 1886)
- THE RAILROAD OF LOVE. Adap. of GOLDFISCHE by F. von Schönthan and G. Kadelburg. Priv. printed, 1887. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 1, 1887)
- THE LOTTERY OF LOVE. Adap. of LES SURPRISES DU DIVORCE by Alexandre Bisson and Antony Mars. Priv. printed, 1889. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 9, 1888)
- UNDERCURRENT. Auto. MS. (Niblo's Garden, Nov. 13, 1888)
- AN INTERNATIONAL MATCH. Adap. of CORNELIUS VOSS by Franz von Schönthan. Priv. printed, 1890. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 5, 1889)
- SAMSON AND DELILAH. Adap. of UN CONCEIL JUDICIAIRE by A. Bisson and J. Moineaux. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, March 28, 1889)
- THE GOLDEN WIDOW. Adap. of LA MARQUISE, by Sardou. Auto. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 2, 1889)
- THE GREAT UNKNOWN. Adap. of DIE BERÜHMTE FRAU by F. von Schönthan and G. Kadelburg. Priv. printed, 1890. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 22, 1889)
- THE LAST WORD. Adap. of DAS LETZTE WORT by F. von Schönthan. Priv. printed, 1891. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 28, 1890)
- LOVE IN TANDEM. Adap. of VIE À DEUX by Henri Bocage and Charles de Courcy. Priv. printed. (Daly's Theatre, Feb. 9, 1892)
- LITTLE MISS MILLION. Adap. of DAS ZWEITE GESICHT by

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

Oscar Blumenthal. Priv. printed, 1893. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 6, 1892)

A TEST CASE. Adap. of GROSSTADTLUFT by O. Blumenthal and G. Kadelburg. Priv. printed, 1893. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 10, 1892)

A BUNDLE OF LIES. Adap. of DER HÖCHSTE TRUMPF by Carl Laufs and Wilhelm Jacoby. MS. (Daly's Theatre, March 28, 1895)

THE TRANSIT OF LEO. Adap. of DAS SCHÖSSKIND by Köhler and Blumenthal. MS. with auto. alterations. (Daly's Theatre, Dec. 10, 1895)

THE COUNTESS GUCKL. From German of F. von Schönthan. Priv. printed, 1895. (Daly's Theatre, Jan. 28, 1896)

The following plays exist in autograph manuscript or type-written copies with "by Augustin Daly" on the title page. They are not mentioned in the life of Daly and have probably not been performed:

AFTER THE WEDDING; OR, A GRAIN OF SAND. From the German of Heineman. Auto. MS.

THE BRIDE OF THE WHIRLWIND. Auto. MS.

A DROP OF POISON. From the German of Oscar Blumenthal.

GRANDMAMA. From the French of Edou[a]rd Cadol.

THE GREEN EYED MONSTER. From the German of Misch and Jacoby.

HONOR. With Jerome K. Jerome. Adap. of DIE EHRE by Hermann Sudermann.

THE KING'S GUARDSMAN. From the French.

A LIMITED LIABILITY; OR, THE LAW OF THE HEART.

LIVING FOR SHOW. From the German. Auto. MS.

LOVE IN A MASK; OUR PRETTY GRANDMOTHERS; OR, SEVENTY YEARS AGO.

AN OLD FASHIONED MARRIAGE. Auto. MS.

ROSE MICHEL.

TEMPERS AND TEMPESTS; OR, EXTREMES TOUCH. From the German of Clement Lithou.

THE TEST ARROW.

TRICKS.

WAR IN PEACE. From the German of Gustav Kadelburg. Auto. MS.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Biographical and Critical

- Daly, Augustin, "The American Dramatist," *North American Review*, CXLII (May, 1886), 485-492.
- "Mr. Augustin Daly's Views," *Harper's Weekly*, Supplement, Feb. 2, 1889.
- Daly, Augustin, *Woffington, a Tribute to the Actress and the Woman*. 1888.
- Daly, Joseph Francis, *The Life of Augustin Daly*. 1917. [The authoritative biography]
- Dithmar, E. A., *Memories of Daly's Theatres*. Priv. printed, 1896.
- "An American School of Dramatic Art": (a) "A Critical Review of Daly's Theatre," by J. R. Towse; (b) "The Inside Workings of the Theatre," by George P. Lathrop, *Century Magazine*, June, 1898.

DAVIS, OWEN

- THROUGH THE BREAKERS. (Star Theatre, Oct. 9, 1899)
- AT YALE. c. 1906. (Kansas City, Sept., 1907)
- CUPID AT VASSAR. c. 1917. (Hartford, Conn., 1911)
- AN OLD SWEETHEART OF MINE. c. 1911. (Richmond, Va., 1911)
- THE FAMILY CUPBOARD. (Playhouse, Aug. 21, 1913)
- SINNERS. MS. (Playhouse, Jan. 7, 1915)
- ROBIN HOOD; OR, THE MERRY OUTLAWS OF SHERWOOD FOREST. c. 1923. (By Frank Lee Short Players, St. Louis, Mo., 1915)
- THE DETOUR. Boston, 1922. (Astor Theatre, Aug. 23, 1921)
- ICEBOUND. Boston, 1923. (Harris Theatre, Feb. 21, 1923)
- HOME FIRES. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Aug. 20, 1923)
- THE NERVOUS WRECK. Dram. novel by E. J. Rath. c. 1926. (Harris Theatre, Oct. 9, 1923)
- THE HAUNTED HOUSE. (Cohan Theatre, Sept. 2, 1924)
- EASY COME, EASY GO. (Cohan Theatre, Oct. 26, 1925)
- GENTLE GRAFTERS. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Oct. 18, 1926)

DAVIS, RICHARD HARDING

- * THE DISREPUTABLE MR. REAGAN. Dram. of story by author. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., March 7, 1895)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- * THE OTHER WOMAN. Dram. of story by author. (Hermann's Theatre, March 23, 1893)
- SOLDIERS OF FORTUNE. Dram. of novel by author. Stage version by Augustus Thomas, q.v.
- THE TAMING OF HELEN. Dram. of *The Lion and the Unicorn*, by author. (Princess Theatre, Toronto, Ontario, Jan. 5, 1903; Savoy Theatre, March 30, 1903)
- RANSON'S FOLLY. Dram. of novel by author. (Providence Opera House, Providence, R. I., Jan. 11, 1904; Hudson Theatre, Jan. 18, 1904)
- THE DICTATOR. 1911. (Criterion Theatre, April 4, 1904; Comedy Theatre, London, May 3, 1905)
- THE GALLOPER. 1909. (Plainfield, N. J., Dec. 16, 1905; Garden Theatre, Jan. 22, 1906)
- * MISS CIVILIZATION. 1920. Dram. of story by James Harvey Smith. (Broadway Theatre, Jan. 26, 1906)
- THE YANKEE TOURIST. Musical comedy based on THE GALLOPER. (Astor Theatre, Aug. 12, 1907)
- VERA, THE MEDIUM. Dram. of novel by author. (Harmanus Bleecker Hall, Albany, Nov. 2, 1908)
- THE SEVENTH DAUGHTER. Based on novel, *Vera, the Medium*, by author. (Colonial Theatre, Cleveland, Ohio, Nov. 10, 1910)
- * BLACKMAIL. (B. F. Keith's Union Square Theatre, March 17, 1913)
- WHO'S WHO. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Aug. 28, 1913; Criterion Theatre, Sept. 11, 1913)
- * PEACE MANOEUVRES. 1914. (By amateurs)
- * THE ZONE POLICE. 1914. (By amateurs)
- THE TRAP. Revision of BLACKMAIL. With Jules Eckert Goodman. (Majestic Theatre, Boston, Sept., 1914; Booth Theatre, Feb. 19, 1915)

Biographical and Critical

Quinby, Henry Cole, *Richard Harding Davis, a Bibliography*. c. 1924.

DAZEY, CHARLES TURNER

IN OLD KENTUCKY. MS. (Grand Opera House, St. Paul, Minn., June, 1893; People's Theatre, Sept. 11, 1893)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

DE MILLE, HENRY C.

JOHN DELMER'S DAUGHTERS. Priv. printed, c. 1883. (Madison Square Theatre, Dec. 10, 1883)

THE MAIN LINE; OR, RAWSON'S Y. With Charles Barnard. (Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 18, 1886)

THE WIFE. With David Belasco, q.v.

LORD CHUMLEY. With David Belasco, q.v.

THE CHARITY BALL. With David Belasco, q.v.

MEN AND WOMEN. With David Belasco, q.v.

THE LOST PARADISE. Adap. of DAS VERLORENE PARADIES, by Ludwig Fulda. c. 1897. (Proctor's Twenty-third St. Theatre, Nov. 16, 1891)

DE MILLE, WILLIAM C.

STRONGHEART. c. 1909. (Hudson Theatre, Jan. 30, 1905)

THE GENIUS. With Cecil B. De Mille. (Bijou Theatre, Oct. 1, 1906)

CLASSMATES. With Margaret Turnbull. (Hudson Theatre, Aug. 29, 1907)

THE WARRENS OF VIRGINIA. (Lyric Theatre, Phila., Nov. 18, 1907; Belasco Theatre, Dec. 3, 1907)

THE ROYAL MOUNTED. With Cecil B. De Mille. (Garrick Theatre, April 6, 1908)

THE WOMAN. (New National Theatre, Washington, D. C., April 17, 1911; Republic Theatre, Sept. 19, 1911)

* FOOD. c. 1914. (Princess Theatre, April 14, 1913)

* IN 1999. c. 1914.

DE WALDEN, T. B.

SAM. (Broadway Theatre, Oct. 9, 1865)

BRITISH NEUTRALITY. (Olympic Theatre, July 1, 1869)

KIT, THE ARKANSAS TRAVELLER. (Boston Theatre, Feb. 14, 1870)

THE BARONESS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Dec. 12, 1872)

DICKINSON, ANNA

AN AMERICAN GIRL. MS. (Haverley's Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 20, 1880)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

DODD, LEE WILSON

THE RETURN OF EVE. (Herald Square Theatre, March 17, 1909)

HIS MAJESTY BUNKER BEAN. Dram. of novel by H. L. Wilson.
c. 1922. (Astor Theatre, Oct. 2, 1916)

PALS FIRST. Dram. of *Pals First* by F. P. Elliott. c. 1925.
(Hartford, Conn., Dec. 27, 1916; Fulton Theatre, Feb. 26,
1917)

THE CHANGELINGS. 1925. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., April
16, 1923; Henry Miller Theatre, Sept. 17, 1923)

DRANSFIELD, JANE

THE LOST PLEIAD. 1918. (Academy of Music, Brooklyn. By
amateurs)

DUNNING, PHILIP

BROADWAY. With George Abbott. 1926. (Broadhurst Theatre,
Sept. 16, 1926)

EATON, WALTER PRICHARD

QUEEN VICTORIA. With David Carb. c. 1923. (Forty-eighth
St. Theatre, Nov. 15, 1923)

ELLIS, EDITH

WHITE COLLARS. c. 1926. (Egan Theatre, Los Angeles, Calif.,
1924; Cort Theatre, Feb. 23, 1925)

EMERY, GILBERT

THE HERO. In Quinn's *Contemporary American Plays*. (Long-
acre Theatre, March 14, 1921; Belmont Theatre, Sept.,
1921)

QUEED. Dram. of novel by H. S. Harrison. (Main St. Theatre,
Long Branch, N. J., July 4, 1921)

TARNISH. c. 1924. (Belmont Theatre, Oct. 1, 1923)

* THANK YOU, DOCTOR. 1924. (In vaudeville)

EPISODE. MS. (Bijou Theatre, Feb. 4, 1925)

LOVE-IN-A-MIST. With Amelie Rives (Princess Troubetzkoy).
c. 1926. (Gaiety Theatre, April 12, 1926)

* THE PERSIAN POPPY. Summit, N. J., c. 1926.

THE HANDKERCHIEF. (Atlantic City, N. J., June 6, 1927)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

EYRE, LAURENCE

THE THINGS THAT COUNT. (Maxine Elliott Theatre, Dec. 8, 1913)

SAZUS MATAZUS. MS. (Atlantic City, N. J., June, 1915)

MISS NELLY OF N'ORLEANS. MS. (Ford's Theatre, Baltimore, June 6, 1919; Henry Miller Theatre, Feb. 4, 1919)

THE MERRY WIVES OF GOTHAM. (Henry Miller Theatre, as FANSHASTICS, Jan. 16, 1924)

FAWCETT, EDGAR

A FALSE FRIEND. (Union Square Theatre, June 21, 1880)

OUR FIRST FAMILIES. (Daly's Theatre, Sept. 23, 1880)

AMERICANS ABROAD. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 5, 1881)

THE BUNTLING BALL. 1884.

THE NEW KING ARTHUR. 1885.

THE EARL. (Hollis St. Theatre, Boston, Mass., April 11, 1887)

FITCH, CLYDE

Plays. Memorial Edition. Edited by Montrose J. Moses and Virginia Gerson. Boston, 1915.

Vol. I. BEAU BRUMMELL; LOVERS' LANE; NATHAN HALE.

Vol. II. BARBARA FRIETCHIE; CAPTAIN JINKS OF THE HORSE MARINES; THE CLIMBERS.

Vol. III. THE STUBBORNNESS OF GERALDINE; THE GIRL WITH THE GREEN EYES; HER OWN WAY.

Vol. IV. THE WOMAN IN THE CASE; THE TRUTH; THE CITY.

BEAU BRUMMELL. 1908. (Madison Square Theatre, May 17, 1890)

*FRÉDÉRIC LEMAÎTRE. MS. (Tremont Theatre, Boston, Dec. 1, 1890; Daly's Theatre, April 22, 1891)

*BETTY'S FINISH. (Boston Museum, Dec. 29, 1890)

PAMELA'S PRODIGY. 1893. (Royal Court Theatre, London, Oct. 21, 1891)

A MODERN MATCH. MS. (Union Square Theatre, March 14, 1892; Royalty Theatre, London, as MARRIAGE 1892, Oct. 28, 1892)

THE MASKED BALL. Adap. of LE VEGLIONE, by Alexandre Bisson and Albert Carré. MS. (Palmer's Theatre, Oct. 3, 1892; Criterion Theatre, London, Jan. 6, 1900)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- THE SOCIAL SWIM. Adap. of LA MAISON NEUVE, by Victorien Sardou. MS. (Alvin Theatre, Pittsburgh, Jan. 12, 1893; Harlem Opera House, Sept. 22, 1893)
- * THE HARVEST. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 25, 1893) Revised as THE MOTH AND THE FLAME, q.v.
- APRIL WEATHER. (Chicago Opera House, May 29, 1893; Daly's Theatre, Nov. 13, 1893)
- A SHATTERED IDOL. Adap. of PÈRE GORIOT by Balzac. (Globe Theatre, St. Paul, July 30, 1893)
- AN AMERICAN DUCHESS. Adap. of LE PRINCE D'AUREC, by Henri Lavedan. (Lyceum Theatre, Nov. 20, 1893)
- MRS. GRUNDY, JR. Adap. from the French. (1893)
- HIS GRACE DE GRAMMONT. MS. (Rockford, Ill., Sept. 22, 1894; Grand Opera House, Chicago, Sept. 24, 1894)
- GOSSIP. With Leo Ditrichstein. Adap. from the French of Jules Claretie. (Palmer's Theatre, March 11, 1895; Grand Theatre, London, June 3, 1895)
- MISTRESS BETTY. (Garrick Theatre, Oct. 15, 1895) Revived as THE TOAST OF THE TOWN, q.v.
- BOHEMIA. Adap. of LA VIE DE BOHÈME by Théodore Barrière and Henri Murger. MS. (Empire Theatre, March 9, 1896)
- THE LIAR. Adap. from the French of Alexandre Bisson. (Walnut St. Theatre, Phila., April 3, 1896; Hoyt's Theatre, Sept. 2, 1896)
- THE SUPERFLUOUS HUSBAND. With Leo Ditrichstein. Adap. from the German of Ludwig Fulda. MS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 4, 1897)
- NATHAN HALE. 1899. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, Jan. 31, 1898; Knickerbocker Theatre, Jan. 2, 1899)
- THE MOTH AND THE FLAME. In *Moses' Representative Plays by American Dramatists*, III. (Chestnut St. Theatre, Phila., Feb. 14, 1898; Lyceum Theatre, April 11, 1898)
- THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY. With Leo Ditrichstein. Adap. of HASEMANN'S TÖCHTER, by Adolph L'Arronge. (Knickerbocker Theatre, Dec. 6, 1898)
- THE COWBOY AND THE LADY. C. 1908. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., March 13, 1899; Duke of York's Theatre, London, June 5, 1899)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- BARBARA FRIETCHIE. 1900. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Oct. 10, 1899; Criterion Theatre, Oct. 23, 1899)
- SAPHO. Dram. of *Sapho*, by Alphonse Daudet with scenes from the play by Alphonse Daudet and Adolphe Belot. MS. (Powers Theatre, Chicago, Oct. 31, 1899; Wallack's Theatre, Feb. 16, 1900)
- CAPTAIN JINKS OF THE HORSE MARINES. 1902. (Walnut St. Theatre, Phila., Jan. 7, 1901; Garrick Theatre, Feb. 4, 1901)
- THE CLIMBERS. 1906. (Bijou Theatre, Jan. 15, 1901; Comedy Theatre, London, Sept. 5, 1903)
- LOVERS' LANE. Boston, 1915. (Manhattan Theatre, Feb. 6, 1901)
- THE LAST OF THE DANDIES. (Her Majesty's Theatre, London, Oct. 24, 1901)
- THE MARRIAGE GAME. Adap. of LE MARIAGE D'OLYMPE, by Emile Augier. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Sept. 23, 1901)
- THE WAY OF THE WORLD. MS. (Hammerstein's Victoria Theatre, Nov. 4, 1901)
- THE GIRL AND THE JUDGE. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Dec. 4, 1901)
- THE STUBBORNNESS OF GERALDINE. 1906. (Garrick Theatre, Nov. 3, 1902)
- THE GIRL WITH THE GREEN EYES. 1905. (Savoy Theatre, Dec. 25, 1902)
- THE BIRD IN THE CAGE. Adap. of DIE HAUBENLERCHE, by Ernst von Wildenbruch. MS. (Bijou Theatre, Jan. 12, 1903)
- THE FRISKY MRS. JOHNSON. Adap. of MADAME FLIRT, by Paul Gavault and Georges Beer. (Princess Theatre, Feb. 9, 1903)
- HER OWN WAY. 1907. (Star Theatre, Buffalo, Sept. 24, 1903; Garrick Theatre, Sept. 28, 1903; Lyric Theatre, London, April 25, 1905)
- MAJOR ANDRÉ. MS. (Savoy Theatre, Nov. 11, 1903)
- GLAD OF IT. MS. (Savoy Theatre, Dec. 28, 1903)
- THE CORONET OF A DUCHESS. MS. (Garrick Theatre, Sept. 21, 1904)
- GRANNY. Adap. of L'AIEULE by Georges Michel. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Oct. 24, 1904)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- COUSIN BILLY. Adap. of LE VOYAGE DE M. PERRICHON, by Eugène Labiche and Edouard Martin. MS. (Criterion Theatre, Jan. 2, 1905)
- THE WOMAN IN THE CASE. Boston, 1915. (Herald Square Theatre, Jan. 30, 1905; Garrick Theatre, London, June 2, 1909)
- HER GREAT MATCH. In Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Syracuse, Sept. 1, 1905; Criterion Theatre, Sept. 4, 1905)
- THE TOAST OF THE TOWN. MS. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Oct. 9, 1905; Daly's Theatre, Nov. 27, 1905)
- WOLFVILLE. With Willis Steell. Dram. of *Wolfville*, by A. H. Lewis. MS. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Oct. 23, 1905)
- THE GIRL WHO HAS EVERYTHING. (Hollis St. Theatre, Boston, March 12, 1906; Liberty Theatre, Dec. 4, 1906)
- TODDLES. Adap. of TRIPLEPATTE, by André Godferneaux and Tristan Bernard. MS. (Duke of York's Theatre, London, Sept. 3, 1906; Baltimore, Feb. 24, 1908; Garrick Theatre, March 16, 1908)
- THE HOUSE OF MIRTH. Dram. with Edith Wharton of her novel. MS. (Detroit Opera House, Sept. 11, 1906; Savoy Theatre, Oct. 22, 1906)
- THE TRUTH. 1907. (Cleveland, Ohio, Oct. 15, 1906; Criterion Theatre, Jan. 7, 1907; Comedy Theatre, London, April 6, 1907; Neues Theater, Berlin, Sept. 24, 1908; Little Theatre, April 14, 1914)
- THE STRAIGHT ROAD. MS. (St. Louis, Dec. 23, 1906; Astor Theatre, Jan. 7, 1907)
- HER SISTER. With Cosmo Gordon Lennox. MS. (Hudson Theatre, Dec. 24, 1907)
- THE HONOR OF THE FAMILY. Adap. of Emile Fabre's dramatization of Balzac's *La Rabouilleuse*. (Hudson Theatre, Feb. 17, 1908)
- GIRLS. Adap. of DIE WELT OHNE MÄNNER, by Alexander Engel and Julius Horst. (Belasco Theatre, Washington, D. C., March 9, 1908; Daly's Theatre, March 23, 1908)
- THE BLUE MOUSE. Adap. from the German of Alexander Engel and Julius Horst. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Nov. 25, 1908; Lyric Theatre, Nov. 30, 1908)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- A HAPPY MARRIAGE. MS. (Schenectady, Jan. 28, 1909; Garrick Theatre, April 12, 1909)
THE BACHELOR. MS. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, March 4, 1909; Maxine Elliott Theatre, March 15, 1909)
THE CITY. Boston, 1915. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Nov. 15, 1909; Lyric Theatre, Dec. 21, 1909)

Biographical and Critical

- Fitch, Clyde, "The Play and the Public." *Smart Set*, XIV (Nov., 1904), 97-100. Rep. in *Plays*, IV, v-xlvi, in revised form.
Bell, Archie, *The Clyde Fitch I Knew*. 1909.
Bernbaum, Martin, "Clyde Fitch, An Appreciation." *Independent*, LXVII (July 15, 1909), 123-131.
Eaton, Walter Prichard, "The Dramatist as Man of Letters. The Case of Clyde Fitch." *Scribner's Magazine*, XLVI (April 1910), 490-497. Rep. in *At the New Theatre and Others*, pp. 258-282.
Lowe, John A., "A Reading List of Clyde Fitch." *Bulletin of Bibliography*, VII (July, 1912), 304.
Moses, Montrose J., and Gerson, Virginia, *Clyde Fitch and His Letters*. Boston, 1924. [The most useful biography]
Phelps, William Lyon, *Essays on Modern Dramatists*, 1921, pp. 142-178.
"The American Stage Loses Clyde Fitch," *Theatre*, X (Oct., 1909), 112.
Steell, Willis, "Clyde Fitch as Collaborator," *Theatre*, X (Dec., 1909), 176-178.
Strang, L. C., *Players and Plays of the Last Quarter Century*, 1902, II, 167-83.

FLAVIN, MARTIN A.

- CHILDREN OF THE MOON. c. 1924. (Comedy Theatre, Aug. 17, 1923)
LADY OF THE ROSE. c. 1925. (Forty-ninth St. Theatre, May 19, 1925)
SERVICE FOR TWO. c. 1927. (Gaiety Theatre, Aug. 30, 1926)
Brains and Other One-Act Plays. c. 1926.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

FORBES, JAMES

- THE CHORUS LADY. c. 1920. (Savoy Theatre, Sept. 1, 1906)
THE TRAVELLING SALESMAN. c. 1916. (Washington, March 16, 1908; Liberty Theatre, Aug. 10, 1908)
THE COMMUTERS. c. 1916. (Criterion Theatre, Aug. 15, 1910)
A RICH MAN'S SON. (Harris Theatre, Nov. 4, 1912)
THE SHOW SHOP. c. 1920. (Hudson Theatre, Dec. 31, 1914)
THE FAMOUS MRS. FAIR. c. 1920. (Academy, Baltimore, Dec. 15, 1919; Henry Miller Theatre, Dec. 22, 1919)
THE ENDLESS CHAIN. (Cohan Theatre, Sept. 4, 1922)
YOUNG BLOOD. (Ritz Theatre, Nov. 24, 1925)

FORD, HARRIET

- A GENTLEMAN OF FRANCE. (Grand Opera House, Chicago, Nov. 5, 1901)
A LITTLE BROTHER TO THE RICH. With J. M. Patterson, q.v.
THE ARGYLE CASE. With Harvey O'Higgins. c. 1927. (Atlantic City, N. J., Oct. 17, 1912)
POLYGAMY. With Harvey O'Higgins. MS. (Columbia Theatre, Washington, D. C., Nov. 1, 1914; Playhouse, Dec. 1, 1914)
MR. LAZARUS. With Harvey O'Higgins, q.v.
IN THE NEXT ROOM. With Eleanor Robson, q.v.

FYLES, FRANKLIN

- THE GIRL I LEFT BEHIND ME. With David Belasco, q.v.
THE GOVERNOR OF KENTUCKY. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 21, 1896)
A WARD OF FRANCE. With E. W. Presbrey. (Wallack's Theatre, Dec. 13, 1897)
KIT CARSON. (American Theatre, May 27, 1901)

GALE, ZONA

- MISS LULU BETT. Dram. of novel of same name. 1921. (Belmont Theatre, Dec. 27, 1920)
MR. PITT. Dram. of novel, *Birth*. 1925. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Jan. 22, 1924)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

GATES, ELEANOR

THE POOR LITTLE RICH GIRL. 1916. (Walnut St. Theatre, Phila., Jan. 7, 1913; Hudson Theatre, July 23, 1913)

WE ARE SEVEN. 1915. (Walnut St. Theatre, Phila., Dec. 8, 1913; Maxine Elliott Theatre, Dec. 24, 1913)

GILLETTE, WILLIAM

THE PROFESSOR. (Madison Square Theatre, June 1, 1881)

ESMERALDA. With Frances Hodgson Burnett. Dram. of story of same name by Mrs. Burnett. 1881. (Madison Square Theatre, Oct. 29, 1881; St. James's Theatre, London, as YOUNG FOLK'S WAYS, Oct. 20, 1883)

THE PRIVATE SECRETARY. Adap. of DER BIBLIOTHEKAR, by G. von Moser. MS. (Comedy Theatre, Sept. 29, 1884, as DIGBY'S SECRETARY)

HELD BY THE ENEMY. c. 1898. (Criterion Theatre, Brooklyn, Feb. 22, 1886; Madison Square Theatre, Aug. 16, 1886; Princess's Theatre, London, April 2, 1887)

SHE. Dram. of novel by Rider Haggard. (Niblo's Garden, Nov. 29, 1887)

A LEGAL WRECK. Pub. in novel form by author, 1888. (Madison Square Theatre, Aug. 14, 1888)

ROBERT ELSMERE. Dram. of novel by Mrs. Humphry Ward. (Union Square Theatre, April 29, 1889)

ALL THE COMFORTS OF HOME. c. 1897. Adap. of EIN TOLLER EINFALL, by Carl Laufs. (Boston Museum, Boston, March 3, 1890; Proctor's Twenty-third St. Theatre, Sept. 8, 1890; Globe Theatre, London, Jan. 24, 1891)

MR. WILKINSON'S WIDOWS. Adap. of FEU TOUPINEL, by Alexandre Bisson. (Washington, D. C., March 23, 1891; Proctor's Twenty-third St. Theatre, March 30, 1891)

SETTLED OUT OF COURT. Adap. of LA FAMILLE PONT-BIQUET by Alexandre Bisson. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Aug. 8, 1892)

NINETY DAYS. (Broadway Theatre, Feb. 6, 1893)

TOO MUCH JOHNSON. c. 1912. (Opera House, Holyoke, Mass., Oct. 25, 1894; Standard Theatre, Nov. 26, 1894; Garrick Theatre, London, April 18, 1898)

SECRET SERVICE. c. 1898. Revised form in Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila.,

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- May 13, 1895; Garrick Theatre, Oct. 5, 1896; Adelphi Theatre, London, May 15, 1897; Renaissance Théâtre, Paris, Oct. 2, 1897)
- BECAUSE SHE LOVED HIM SO. Adap. of JALOUSE by Alexandre Bisson and Adolphe Leclercq. MS. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Oct. 28, 1898; Madison Square Theatre, Jan. 16, 1899)
- SHERLOCK HOLMES. London, 1922. (Star Theatre, Buffalo, Oct. 24, 1899; Garrick Theatre, Nov. 6, 1899; Lyceum Theatre, London, Sept. 2, 1901)
- * THE PAINFUL PREDICAMENT OF SHERLOCK HOLMES. (Metropolitan Opera House, March 23, 1905)
- CLARICE. MS. (Duke of York's Theatre, London, Sept. 13, 1905; Garrick Theatre, Oct. 16, 1906)
- * THE RED OWL. In *One Act Plays for Stage and Study*, 1924. (1907)
- * TICEY; OR, THAT LITTLE AFFAIR OF BOYD'S. (Columbia Theatre, Washington, D. C., June 15, 1908; Liberty Theatre, Dec. 18, 1908)
- SAMSON. Adap. of SAMSON, by Henri Bernstein. MS. (Lyceum Theatre, Rochester, Oct. 9, 1908; Criterion Theatre, Oct. 19, 1908)
- * THE ROBBER. (Coliseum, London, Aug. 9, 1909)
- * AMONG THIEVES. In *One Act Plays for Stage and Study*, Second Series, 1925. (Palace Theatre, London, Sept. 6, 1909)
- ELECTRICITY. In *The Drama*, No. 12 (Nov., 1913), 13-123. Repub. c. 1914. (Park Theatre, Boston, Sept. 26, 1910; Lyceum Theatre, Oct. 31, 1910)
- THE DREAM MAKER. Dram. of short story by H. E. Merton. (Empire Theatre, Nov. 21, 1921)
- WINNIE AND THE WOLVES. Dram. of short stories by Bertram Akey. (Lyric Theatre, Phila., May 21, 1923)

Biographical and Critical

- "Mr. William Gillette Surveys the Field." *Harper's Weekly*, Supplement, Feb. 2, 1889.
- Gillette, William, "On the Illusion of the First Time in Acting," *Publications of the Dramatic Museum of Columbia University*, Ser. 2, Vol. I, 1915.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Burton, Richard, "William Gillette." *The Drama*, No. 12 (Nov., 1913), 5-11.

Clapp, J. B., and Edgett, E. F., *Plays of the Present*. 1902.

Hapgood, Norman, *The Stage in America*, 1901, pp. 61-79.

S[cott] C[lement], *The Theatre* (London), XVIII (April 2, 1887), 281-283.

GLASPELL, SUSAN

* SUPPRESSED DESIRES. With George Cram Cook. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Wharf Theatre, Provincetown, Summer, 1915)

* TRIFLES. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. Dram. of her story, "A Jury of Her Peers." (Wharf Theatre, Provincetown, Summer, 1916)

* THE PEOPLE. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Playwrights' Theatre, 1917)

* CLOSE THE BOOK. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Playwrights' Theatre, 1917)

* THE OUTSIDE. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Playwrights' Theatre, 1917-18)

* WOMAN'S HONOR. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Playwrights' Theatre, 1918)

* TICKLESS TIME. With George Cram Cook. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Playwrights' Theatre, 1918)

BERNICE. In *Plays*, Boston, 1920. (Playwrights' Theatre, March 21, 1919)

THE INHERITORS. Boston, 1921. (Playwrights' Theatre, March 21, 1921)

THE VERGE. Boston, 1922. (Playwrights' Theatre, Nov. 14, 1921)

GOODRICH, ARTHUR

YES OR NO. (Murat Theatre, Indianapolis, Oct. 11, 1917; Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Dec. 21, 1917)

SO THIS IS LONDON! c. 1926. (Hudson Theatre, Aug. 30, 1922)

CAPONSACCHI. With Rose A. Palmer. Dram. of *The Ring and the Book*, by Robert Browning. 1927. (Murat Theatre, Indianapolis, April 3, 1923; Hampden's Theatre, Oct. 26, 1926)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

GREEN, PAUL

- THE LORD'S WILL AND OTHER CAROLINA PLAYS. 1925. (By
The Carolina Playmakers)
LONESOME ROAD. 1926.
IN ABRAHAM'S BOSOM. 1927. (Provincetown Theatre, Dec.
30, 1926)
THE FIELD GOD. 1927. (Werba's Theatre, Brooklyn, April 11,
1927; Greenwich Village Theatre, April 21, 1927)

HAMILTON, CLAYTON

- THE BIG IDEA. With A. E. Thomas, q.v.
THE BETTER UNDERSTANDING. With A. E. Thomas, q.v.
THIRTY DAYS. With A. E. Thomas, q.v.
FRIEND INDEED. With B. Voight. c. 1926. (Central Park
Theatre, April 26, 1926)

HARRIGAN, EDWARD

- The autograph MSS. are in possession of Dr. Anthony Hart Harrigan. In addition to plays given, record has been found of seventy-one titles of one-act variety sketches, 1870-9.
- * THE PORTER'S TROUBLES. 1875. (Theatre Comique, April 12, 1875)
THE BLUE AND THE GRAY. 1875. (Theatre Comique, Aug. 7, 1876)
DARBY AND LANTY. See DOYLE BROTHERS. (Theatre Comique, Aug. 21, 1876)
* THE EDITOR'S TROUBLES. 1875. (Theatre Comique, Sept. 4, 1876)
IASCAIRE. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Nov. 20, 1876)
OLD LAVENDER. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Sept. 3, 1877)
THE LORGAIRE. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Feb. 18, 1878; in revised form, Dec. 10, 1888)
THE DOYLE BROTHERS. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Aug. 19, 1878)
THE MULLIGAN GUARD PICNIC. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Sept. 23, 1878; in revised form, Aug. 9, 1880)
THE MULLIGAN GUARD BALL. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Jan. 13, 1879)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- THE MULLIGAN GUARD CHOWDER. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Aug. 11, 1879)
- THE MULLIGAN GUARDS' CHRISTMAS. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Nov. 17, 1879)
- THE MULLIGAN GUARD SURPRISE. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Feb. 16, 1880)
- THE MULLIGAN SURPRISE PARTY. Auto. MS. Variant of above.
- THE MULLIGAN GUARD NOMINEE. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Nov. 22, 1880)
- THE MULLIGANS' SILVER WEDDING. Auto. MS. (Theatre Comique, Feb. 21, 1881)
- THE MAJOR. Auto. MS. (New Theatre Comique, Aug. 29, 1881)
- SQUATTER SOVEREIGNTY. Auto. MS. (New Theatre Comique, Jan. 9, 1882)
- MORDECAI LYONS. (New Theatre Comique, Oct. 26, 1882)
- McSORLEY'S INFLATION. Auto. MS. (New Theatre Comique, Nov. 27, 1882)
- THE MUDDY DAY. Auto. MS. (New Theatre Comique, April 2, 1883)
- CORDELIA'S ASPIRATIONS. Auto. MS. (partially). (New Theatre Comique, Nov. 5, 1883)
- DAN'S TRIBULATIONS. Auto. MS. (New Theatre Comique, April 7, 1884)
- INVESTIGATION. MS. (New Theatre Comique, Sept. 1, 1884)
- McALLISTER'S LEGACY. (New Park Theatre, Jan. 5, 1885)
- ARE YOU INSURED? MS. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, May 11, 1885)
- THE GRIP. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Park Theatre, Nov. 30, 1885)
- THE LEATHER PATCH. MS. (Harrigan's Park Theatre, Feb. 15, 1886)
- THE O'REAGANS. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Park Theatre, Oct. 11, 1886)
- McNOONEY'S VISIT. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Park Theatre, Jan. 31, 1887; later as 4-11-44, March 21, 1889)
- PETE. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Park Theatre, Nov. 22, 1887)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- WADDY GOOGAN. MS. (Harrigan's Park Theatre, Sept. 3, 1888)
- REILLY AND THE FOUR HUNDRED. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Theatre, Dec. 29, 1890)
- THE LAST OF THE HOGANS. MS. (Harrigan's Theatre, Dec. 21, 1891)
- THE WOOLEN STOCKING. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Theatre, Oct. 9, 1893)
- NOTORIETY. Auto. MS. (Harrigan's Theatre, Dec. 10, 1894)
- MARTY MALONE. Auto. MS. (Bijou Theatre, Aug. 13, 1896)
- SARGENT HICKEY. Auto. MS. Variety sketch, revision of
LAST OF THE HOGANS. (Proctor's Theatre, 23rd St., Sept. 20, 1897)
- UNDER COVER. Auto. MS. (Murray Hill Theatre, Sept. 14, 1903)
- THE SIMPLE LIFE. Variety Sketch. (Yorkville Theatre, Jan. 16, 1905)
- IN THE NORTH WOODS. MS. [Not produced]

Biographical and Critical

- "Mr. Edward Harrigan Speaks." *Harper's Weekly*, Supplement, Feb. 2, 1889.
- Harrigan, Edward, *The Mulligans*. [A novel] 1901.
- M[ontgomery], G. E., "Edward Harrigan." *The Theatre*, I (1886), 397-398.
- Quinn, A. H., "The Perennial Humor of the American Stage." *Yale Review*, XVI (April, 1927), 553-566.

HARTE, BRET

- TWO MEN FROM SANDY BAR. Boston, 1876. (Union Square Theatre, Aug. 28, 1876)
- ALL SIN. With Mark Twain. MS. (National Theatre, Washington, D. C., May 7, 1877; Daly's Fifth Ave. Theatre, July 31, 1877)
- SUE. With T. Edgar Pemberton. London, 1902. (Hoyt's Theatre, Sept. 15, 1896; Garrick Theatre, London, June 10, 1898)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Biographical and Critical

The Letters of Bret Harte. Assembled and edited by Geoffrey Bret Harte. Boston, 1926.

Merwin, Henry C., *The Life of Bret Harte.* Boston, 1911.

Pemberton, T. Edgar, *The Life of Bret Harte.* London, 1903.

See pp. 257-295, "In and About Stageland."

HAZELTON, GEORGE COCHRANE JR.

MISTRESS NELL. Phila., 1900. (Denver, June, 1900; Bijou Theatre, Oct. 9, 1900)

CAPTAIN MOLLY. (Manhattan Theatre, Sept. 8, 1902)

THE YELLOW JACKET. With J. H. Benrimo. Indianapolis, c. 1913. (Fulton Theatre, Nov. 4, 1912)

HERNE, JAMES A.

MSS. are in possession of Mrs. James A. Herne.

CHARLES O'MALLEY. Dram. of Lever's novel. (Maguire's New Theatre, San Francisco, Nov. 11, 1874)

OLIVER TWIST. Dram. of Dickens' novel. (Maguire's New Theatre, San Francisco, Nov. 26, 1874)

WITHIN AN INCH OF HIS LIFE. With David Belasco. Dram. of Story by Gaboriau. (Grand Opera House, San Francisco, Feb. 17, 1879)

MARRIAGE BY MOONLIGHT. Later called HAP-HAZARD. With David Belasco. Acts I, III, IV, V. MS. (Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, June 30, 1879)

HEARTS OF OAK. With David Belasco. MS. (First as CHUMS, Baldwin Theatre, San Francisco, Sept. 9, 1879; as HEARTS OF OAK, Hamlin's Theatre, Chicago, Nov. 17, 1879; New Fifth Ave. Theatre, March 29, 1880)

THE MINUTE MEN OF 1774-75. MS. (Chestnut St. Theatre, Phila., April 6, 1886)

DRIFTING APART. MS. under title of MARY, THE FISHERMAN'S CHILD. (People's Theatre, May 7, 1888)

MARGARET FLEMING. MS. (Lynn Theatre, Lynn, Mass., July 4, 1890; Chickering Hall, Boston, May 4, 1891; Palmer's Theatre, Dec. 9, 1891)

MY COLLEEN. (People's Theatre, May 9, 1892)

SHORE ACRES. MS. (First as SHORE ACRES SUBDIVISION,

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- McVicker's Theatre, Chicago, May 17-30, 1892; as **UNCLE NAT**, May 30-June 11, 1892; as **SHORE ACRES**, Boston Museum, Feb. 20, 1893; Fifth Ave. Theatre, Oct. 30, 1893)
THE REVEREND GRIFFITH DAVENPORT. MS. of Act IV. (Lafayette Square Theatre, Washington, D. C., Jan. 16, 1899; Herald Square Theatre, Jan. 31, 1899)
SAG HARBOR. MS. (Park Theatre, Boston, Oct. 24, 1899; Republic Theatre, Sept. 27, 1900)

Biographical and Critical

- Herne, James A., "Old Stock Days in the Theatre." *Arena*, VI (Sept., 1892), 401-416.
 Herne, James A., "Art for Truth's Sake in the Drama." *Arena*, XVII (Feb., 1897), 361-370.
 Corbin, John, "Drama." *Harper's Weekly*, XLIII (Feb. 11 and March 4, 1899), 139-213. [Griffith Davenport]
 Flower, B. O., "Mask or Mirror." *Arena*, VIII (Aug., 1893), 304-313.
 Garland, Hamlin, "Mr. and Mrs. Herne." *Arena*, IV (Oct., 1891), 543-560.
 Garland, Hamlin, "On The Road with James A. Herne." *Century Magazine*, N. S. LXXXVIII (Aug., 1914), 574-581.
 "An Appreciation: James A. Herne, Actor, Dramatist and Man." Articles by Hamlin Garland, J. J. Enneking and B. O. Flower. *Arena*, XXVI (Sept. 1901), 282-91.
 Hapgood, Norman. *The Stage in America*, pp. 61-69.
 Howells, W. D., Editor's Study, *Harper's Magazine*, LXXXIII (Aug., 1891), 478-479 [Margaret Fleming]
 Tiempo, Marco, "James A. Herne in Griffith Davenport." *Arena*, XXII (Sept., 1899), 375-382.

HOOKER, WILLIAM BRIAN

- MONA**. 1911. (Metropolitan Opera House, March 14, 1912)
FAIRYLAND. New Haven, 1915.
MORVEN AND THE GRAIL. 1915.
CYRANO DE BERGERAC. Adap. of play by Edmond Rostand. 1924. (National Theatre, Nov. 1, 1923)
THE WHITE BIRD. New Haven, 1924.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

HOUSUM, ROBERT

THE GYPSY TRAIL. c. 1920. (Plymouth Theatre, Dec. 4, 1917)
A VERY GOOD YOUNG MAN. With Martin Brown. (Plymouth Theatre, Aug. 19, 1918)

*THE CORSICAN LIEUTENANT. In *One-Act Plays for Stage and Study*, Second Series.

SYLVIA RUNS AWAY. New York, n. d.

HOWARD, BRONSON

FANTINE. (Detroit, 1864)

SARATOGA; OR, PISTOLS FOR SEVEN. c. 1870. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Dec. 21, 1870; Court Theatre, London, as BRIGHTON, May 25, 1874)

DIAMONDS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 3, 1872)

LILLIAN'S LAST LOVE. See THE BANKER'S DAUGHTER.

MOORCROFT; OR, THE DOUBLE WEDDING. Auto. MS. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Oct. 17, 1874)

ONLY A TRAMP. MS. dated 1878. See BARON RUDOLPH.

HURRICANES. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, May 27, 1878; Criterion Theatre, London, as TRUTH, Feb. 8, 1879)

OLD LOVE LETTERS. Priv. printed, 1897. (Park Theatre, Aug. 31, 1878)

THE BANKER'S DAUGHTER. Priv. printed, 1878. (Union Square Theatre, Sept. 30, 1878; Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, as LILLIAN'S LAST LOVE, Sept. 4, 1873; Court Theatre, London, as THE OLD LOVE AND THE NEW, Dec. 15, 1879)

WIVES. Adap. of L'ECOLE DES MARIS and L'ECOLE DES FEMMES, by Molière. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Oct. 18, 1879)

BARON RUDOLPH. MS., (Royal Theatre, Hull, England, Aug. 1, 1881; Grand Opera House, Sept. 12, 1881 [see text])

FUN IN A GREEN ROOM. (Booth's Theatre, April 10, 1882)

YOUNG MRS. WINTHROP. c. 1899. (Madison Square Theatre, Oct. 9, 1882; Marylebone Theatre, London, Sept. 21, 1882 [copyright]; Court Theatre, London, Nov. 6, 1884)

ONE OF OUR GIRLS. Priv. printed, 1897. (Lyceum Theatre, Nov. 10, 1885)

MET BY CHANCE. (Lyceum Theatre, Jan. 11, 1887)

THE HENRIETTA. Priv. printed, 1901. (Union Square Theatre,

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- Sept. 26, 1887; Knickerbocker Theatre, Dec. 22, 1913, as
THE NEW HENRIETTA)
- KNAVE AND QUEEN.** With Sir Charles Young. MS. [1887]
- SHENANDOAH.** Priv. printed, 1897. In Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Boston Museum, Nov. 19, 1888; Star Theatre, Sept. 9, 1889)
- ARISTOCRACY.** Priv. printed, 1898. (Palmer's Theatre, Nov. 14, 1892)
- PETER STUYVESANT.** With Brander Matthews. MS. (Providence, R. I., Sept. 25, 1899; Wallack's Theatre, Oct. 2, 1899)
- KATE.** 1906.

Biographical and Critical

- "Mr. Bronson Howard Illustrates and Defines." *Harper's Weekly*, Supplement, Feb. 2, 1889.
- Howard, Bronson, *The Autobiography of a Play*. Reprinted, with an Introduction by Augustus Thomas, by the Dramatic Museum of Columbia University. 1914.
- In Memoriam, Bronson Howard. Addresses Delivered at the Memorial Meeting, Oct. 18, 1908.* Privately printed by the American Dramatists' Club. 1910. [The authoritative biographical source. Contains: "An Appreciation," by Brander Matthews, based on his article in the *North American Review*; "A Brief Biography," by H. P. Mawson, "The Autobiography of a Play," by Bronson Howard; a list of Howard's plays, with casts]
- Archer, William, *English Dramatists of To-day*. London, 1882.
- M[ontgomery], G. E., "Bronson Howard," *The Theatre*, I (Aug. 2, 1886), 469-470.
- Clark, Barrett H., *A Study of the Modern Drama*, 1925, pp. 362-368.
- Matthews, Brander, "Bronson Howard" in *Gateways to Literature*. 1912.

HOWARD, SIDNEY

- SWORDS.** C. 1921. (National Theatre, Sept. 1, 1921)
- S. S. TENACITY.** Adap. from French of Charles Vildrac. (Belmont Theatre, Jan. 2, 1922)
- CASANOVA.** Adap. from Spanish of Lorenzo de Azertis. (Empire Theatre, Sept. 26, 1923)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- SANCHO PANZA. Adap. from Hungarian of Melchoir Lengyel. (Hudson Theatre, Nov. 26, 1923)
- BEWITCHED. With Edward Sheldon. MS. (Allentown, Pa., Sept. 26, 1924)
- THEY KNEW WHAT THEY WANTED. 1925. (Garrick Theatre, Nov. 24, 1924)
- MICHEL AUCLAIR. Adap. from MICHEL AUCLAIR, by Charles Vildrac. (Provincetown Theatre, March 4, 1925)
- LUCKY SAM MCCARVER. 1926. (Playhouse, Oct. 21, 1925)
- THE LAST NIGHT OF DON JUAN. Adap. from Edmond Rostand. (Greenwich Village Theatre, Nov. 9, 1925)
- MORALS. With Charles Recht. Adap. of MORALE, by Ludwig Thoma. (Comedy Theatre, Nov. 30, 1925)
- NED MCCOBB'S DAUGHTER. 1926. (John Golden Theatre, Nov. 22, 1926)
- THE SILVER CORD. 1927. (John Golden Theatre, Dec. 20, 1926)

HOWELLS, WILLIAM DEAN

- SAMSON. Adap. of SANSONE by Ippolito D'Aste. 1889. (Olympic Theatre, St. Louis, Oct. 5, 1874; Palmer's Theatre, Oct. 13, 1889)
- *THE PARLOR CAR. Boston, 1876.
- OUT OF THE QUESTION. Boston, c. 1877.
- A COUNTERFEIT PRESENTMENT. Boston, c. 1877. (Grand Opera House, Cincinnati, O., Oct. 11, 1877)
- YORICK'S LOVE. Adap. from UN DRAMA NUEVO, by Tamayo y Baus. MS. (Euclid Ave. Opera House, Chicago, Oct. 25, 1878; Lyceum Theatre, London, April 14, 1884)
- *THE SLEEPING CAR. Boston, 1883.
- *THE REGISTER. Boston, 1884.
- *THE ELEVATOR. Boston, 1885.
- A FOREGONE CONCLUSION. Dram. of novel of the same name. (Madison Square Theatre, Nov. 18, 1886)
- THE AMERICAN CLAIMANT; OR, MULBERRY SELLERS TEN YEARS LATER. With Mark Twain. (Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 23, 1887)
- *THE GARROTTERS. 1886. (Avenue Theatre, London, Nov. 30, 1895, as A DANGEROUS RUFFIAN)
- A SEA CHANGE; OR, LOVE'S STOWAWAY. Boston, 1888.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- *THE MOUSE TRAP. c. 1889. (Queen's Hall, London, bef. 1904 by Mrs. Kendal)
- *FIVE O'CLOCK TEA. c. 1889.
- *A LIKELY STORY. c. 1889.
- *THE ALBANY DEPOT. 1892.
- *A LETTER OF INTRODUCTION. 1892.
- *UNEXPECTED GUESTS. c. 1893.
- *EVENING DRESS. c. 1893.
- *A MASTERPIECE OF DIPLOMACY. *Harper's Magazine*, LXXX-VIII (Feb., 1894), 371-385.
- *A PREVIOUS ENGAGEMENT. 1897.
- *BRIDE ROSES. 1900.
- *ROOM FORTY-FIVE. 1900.
- *INDIAN GIVER. 1900.
- *THE SMOKING CAR. Boston, 1900.
- *HER OPINION OF HIS STORY. *Harper's Bazaar*, XLI (May, 1907), 429.
- *SAVED: AN EMOTIONAL DRAMA. *Harper's Weekly*, LII (Dec., 1908), 22-24.
- *A TRUE HERO: MELODRAMA. *Harper's Magazine*, CXIX (Nov., 1909), 866-875.
- THE MOTHER AND THE FATHER. 1909.
- *PARTING FRIENDS. 1911.
- *THE IMPOSSIBLE: A MYSTERY PLAY. *Harper's Magazine*, CXXII (Dec., 1910), 116-125.
- *THE NIGHT BEFORE CHRISTMAS. In *The Daughter of the Storage*, 1916.
- *SELF-SACRIFICE: A FARCE TRAGEDY. In *The Daughter of the Storage*, 1916.

Biographical and Critical

- Howells, W. D., "The New Taste in Theatricals." *Atlantic Monthly*, XXIII (May, 1869), 635-644.
- Howells, W. D., Editor's Study. *Harper's Magazine*, LXXIX (June, 1889), 314-319.
- Howells, W. D., "The Recent Dramatic Season." *North American Review*, CLXXII (March, 1901), 468-480.
- Cooke, Delmar Gross, *William Dean Howells: A Critical Study*, c. 1922.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Firkins, Oscar W., *William Dean Howells, A Study*. Cambridge, 1924.

HOYT, CHARLES HALE

CEZALIA. MS. (Globe Theatre, Boston, 1882?)

A BUNCH OF KEYS. With Willie Edouin. MS. (Newark, N. J., Dec., 1882; San Francisco Music Hall, New York, March 26, 1883)

A RAG BABY. MS. (Haverley's Theatre, Aug. 16, 1884)

A PARLOR MATCH. MS. (Tony Pastor's Opera House, Sept. 22, 1884)

A TIN SOLDIER. MS. (Standard Theatre, May 3, 1886)

THE MAID AND THE MOONSHINER. With Edward Solomon. (Standard Theatre, Aug. 16, 1886)

A HOLE IN THE GROUND. MS. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, Sept. 12, 1887)

A BRASS MONKEY. MS. (Bijou Theatre, Oct. 15, 1888)

A MIDNIGHT BELL. MS. (Bijou Theatre, March 5, 1889)

A TEXAS STEER. In *Moses' Representative American Dramas*. (Bijou Theatre, Nov. 10, 1890)

A TRIP TO CHINATOWN. MS. (Hoyt's Madison Square Theatre, Nov. 9, 1891)

A TEMPERANCE TOWN. MS. (Hoyt's Madison Square Theatre, Sept. 18, 1893)

A MILK WHITE FLAG. MS. (Wilkes-Barre, Pa., Dec. 23, 1893; Hoyt's Theatre, Oct. 8, 1894)

A RUNAWAY COLT. MS. (American Theatre, Dec. 2, 1895)

A BLACK SHEEP. MS. (Hoyt's Theatre, Jan. 6, 1896)

A CONTENTED WOMAN. MS. (Hoyt's Theatre, Jan. 4, 1897)

A STRANGER IN NEW YORK. MS. (Garrick Theatre, Sept. 13, 1897)

A DAY AND A NIGHT IN NEW YORK. MS. (Garrick Theatre, Aug. 30, 1898)

A DOG IN THE MANGER. MS.

HUGHES, HATCHER

WAKE UP, JONATHAN! With Elmer L. Rice. (Henry Miller Theatre, Jan. 17, 1921)

HELL-BENT FER HEAVEN. 1924. (Klaw Theatre, Jan. 4, 1924)

RUINT. 1925. (Provincetown Theatre, April 7, 1925)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

JAMES, HENRY

- DAISY MILLER. Dram. of novel by author. Boston, 1883.
THE AMERICAN. Dram. of novel by author. (Southport, England, Jan. 3, 1891)
GUY DOMVILLE. (St. James's Theatre, London, Jan. 5, 1895)
THE HIGH BID. (Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh, March 6, 1908)
Theatricals.
First Series. London, 1894. Contains TENANTS and DIS-ENGAGED. (Hudson Theatre, March 11, 1909)
Second Series. 1895. Contains THE ALBUM and THE REPROBATE.
THE SALOON. (Little Theatre, London, Jan. 17, 1911)

Biographical and Critical

- Gosse, Edmund, "Henry James." *Scribner's Magazine*, April, 1920.
Matthews, Brander, "Henry James and the Theater." In *Playwrights on Playmaking*, pp. 187-204.

JOHNSTON, MARY

- THE GODDESS OF REASON. Boston. 1907. (Majestic Theatre, Boston, Dec. 21, 1908; Daly's Theatre, Feb. 15, 1909)

KAUFMAN, GEORGE S.

- SOME ONE IN THE HOUSE. With Larry Evans and Walter Percival. (Knickerbocker Theatre, Sept. 9, 1918)
DULCY. With Marc Connelly. 1921. (Indianapolis, Feb. 14, 1921; Frazee Theatre, Aug. 13, 1921)
TO THE LADIES. With Marc Connelly. In Quinn's *Contemporary American Plays*. (Lyceum Theatre, Rochester, Feb. 13, 1922; Liberty Theatre, Feb. 20, 1922)
MERTON OF THE MOVIES. With Marc Connelly. Dram. of story by H. L. Wilson. c. 1925. (Brooklyn, Oct. 16, 1922; Cort Theatre, Nov. 13, 1922)
THE DEEP TANGLED WILDWOOD. With Marc Connelly. (Frazee Theatre, Nov. 5, 1923)
BEGGAR ON HORSEBACK. With Marc Connelly. (Broadhurst Theatre, Feb. 12, 1924)
MINICK. With Edna Ferber. Dram. of novel by Edna Ferber. Garden City, 1924. (Booth Theatre, Sept. 24, 1924)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

THE BUTTER AND EGG MAN. 1925. (Longacre Theatre, Sept. 23, 1925)

THE GOOD FELLOW. With Herman J. Mankiewicz. (Playhouse, Oct. 7, 1926)

KEARNEY, PATRICK

A MAN'S MAN. 1925. (Fifty-second St. Theatre, Oct. 13, 1925)

KELLY, GEORGE EDWARD

The Flattering Word and Other One-Act Plays. Boston, 1925.
[In vaudeville]

THE TORCHBEARERS. 1923. (Savoy Theatre, Asbury Park, N. J., Aug. 14, 1922; Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Aug. 29, 1922)

THE SHOW-OFF. Boston, 1924. (Playhouse, Feb. 4, 1924)

CRAIG'S WIFE. Boston, 1926. (Morosco Theatre, Oct. 12, 1925)

DAISY MAYME. Boston, 1927. (Playhouse, Nov. 24, 1926)

KENNEDY, CHARLES RANN

THE SERVANT IN THE HOUSE. 1908. (Duke of York's Theatre, London, March 19, 1907; Savoy Theatre, March 23, 1908)

THE WINTERFEAST. 1908. (Savoy Theatre, Nov. 30, 1908)

THE FLOWER OF THE PALACE OF HAN. (Little Theatre, March 19, 1912)

*THE TERRIBLE MEEK. 1912. (Little Theatre, March 19, 1912)

*THE NECESSARY EVIL. 1913. (Fine Arts Theatre, Chicago, May 12, 1913)

THE IDOL BREAKER. 1914.

THE RIB OF THE MAN. 1917.

THE ARMY WITH BANNERS. 1919. (Théâtre du Vieux Colom-bier, New York, April 9, 1918)

THE FOOL FROM THE HILLS. 1919.

THE CHASTENING. 1922.

THE ADMIRAL. 1923.

THE SALUTATION. 1925.

KENYON, CHARLES

KINDLING. 1914. (Los Angeles, Calif., July 31, 1911; Daly's Theatre, Dec. 5, 1911)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

HUSBAND AND WIFE. (Forty-fourth St. Theatre, Sept. 21, 1915)
THE CLAIM. With Frank Doré. (Royal Alexandra Theatre,
Toronto, Can., May 28, 1917; Fulton Theatre, Oct. 17,
1917)

KIRKPATRICK, JUDSON

ALLATOONA. With J. Owen Moore. New York, n. d. (Eagle
Theatre, Oct. 22, 1877, First?)

KLEIN, CHARLES

BY PROXY. (Boston Museum, June 27, 1892)
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY. With Harrison Grey Fiske. (Ameri-
can Theatre, Jan. 21, 1895)
TWO LITTLE VAGRANTS. Adap. of LES DEUX GOSSES, by Pierre
de Courcelles. (Academy of Music, Nov. 23, 1896)
HEARTSEASE. With J. I. C. Clarke. c. 1916. (Garden The-
atre, Jan. 11, 1897)
A ROYAL ROGUE. (Broadway Theatre, Dec. 24, 1900)
THE AUCTIONEER. With Lee Arthur. (Hyperion Theatre, New
Haven, Conn., Sept. 9, 1901; Bijou Theatre, Sept. 23, 1901)
THE MUSIC MASTER. (Atlantic City, N. J., Sept. 12, 1904;
Belasco Theatre, Sept. 26, 1904)
THE LION AND THE MOUSE. [1916] (Lyceum Theatre, Nov.
20, 1905)
DAUGHTERS OF MEN. [1917] (Astor Theatre, Nov. 19, 1906)
THE THIRD DEGREE. [1917] (Hudson Theatre, Feb. 1, 1909;
as FIND THE WOMAN, Garrick Theatre, London, June 17,
1912)
THE NEXT OF KIN. [1917] (Hudson Theatre, Dec. 27, 1909)
THE GAMBLERS. [1916] (Lyric Theatre, Chicago, Sept. 26,
1910)
MAGGIE PEPPER. [1916] (New Haven Opera House, Jan. 30,
1911; Harris Theatre, Aug. 31, 1911)
POTASH AND PERLMUTTER. Dram. of stories by Montague
Glass. (Cohan Theatre, Aug. 16, 1913)
THE MONEY MAKERS. (Booth Theatre, Oct. 5, 1914)

Biographical and Critical

Klein, Charles, "Religion, Philosophy and the Drama." *Arena*,
XXXVII, (May, 1907), 492-497.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

KNOBLOCK, EDWARD

- THE CLUB BABY. With Laurence Sterner. (Parkhurst Theatre, London, Oct. 14, 1895)
- THE SHULAMITE. With Claude Askew. Dram. of novel of same name. (Savoy Theatre, London, May 12, 1906; Lyric Theatre, Oct. 29, 1906)
- THE COTTAGE IN THE AIR. Dram. of *The Princess Priscilla's Fortnight*, by author of *Elizabeth and Her German Garden*. (New Theatre, Nov. 11, 1909)
- THE FAUN. (Daly's Theatre, Jan. 16, 1911)
- KISMET. 1911. (Garrick Theatre, London, April 19, 1911; Knickerbocker Theatre, Dec. 25, 1911)
- MILESTONES. With Arnold Bennett. 1912. (Royalty Theatre, London, March 5, 1912; Liberty Theatre, Sept. 17, 1912)
- DISCOVERING AMERICA. (Daly's Theatre, Sept. 7, 1912)
- THE HEAD-MASTER. With W. T. Coleby. London, 1913. (Playhouse, London, Jan. 22, 1913)
- MY LADY'S DRESS. 1916. (Royalty Theatre, London, April 21, 1914; Playhouse, Oct. 10, 1914)
- MARIE ODILE. 1915. (Belasco Theatre, Washington, D. C., Jan. 19, 1915; His Majesty's Theatre, London, June 8, 1915)
- * A WAR COMMITTEE. London, 1915. (Haymarket Theatre, London, July 2, 1915)
- * THE LITTLE SILVER RING. London, 1915. (Theatrical Garden Party, Regent's Park, London, July 20, 1915)
- PAGANINI. c. 1915. (Criterion Theatre, Sept. 11, 1916)
- TIGER! TIGER! 1924. (Belasco Theatre, Nov. 12, 1918)
- ONE. (Savoy Theatre, Asbury Park, July 5, 1920)
- THE LULLABY. 1924. (Knickerbocker Theatre, Sept. 17, 1923)

KUMMER, CLARE

- GOOD GRACIOUS ANNABELLE. c. 1922. (Republic Theatre, Oct. 31, 1916)
- A SUCCESSFUL CALAMITY. c. 1922. (Booth Theatre, Feb. 17, 1917)
- THE RESCUING ANGEL. (Hudson Theatre, Oct. 8, 1917)
- BE CALM, CAMILLA. c. 1922. (Booth Theatre, Oct. 31, 1918)
- ROLLO'S WILD OAT. c. 1922. (Columbia Theatre, Far Rock-

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

away, N. Y., Jan. 30, 1920; Punch and Judy Theatre, Nov. 23, 1920)

THE MOUNTAIN MAN. (Maxine Elliott Theatre, Dec. 12, 1921)

* THE CHORUS REHEARSAL. (Punch and Judy Theatre, 1921)

* CHINESE LOVE. (Punch and Judy Theatre, 1921)

* BRIDGES. (Punch and Judy Theatre, 1921)

* THE ROBBERY. (Punch and Judy Theatre, 1921)

POMEROY'S PAST. (Garrick Theatre, Phila., Sept. 18, 1922;
Longacre Theatre, April 19, 1926)

LACY, ERNEST

* CHATTERTON. In *Plays and Sonnets*. Phila., 1900. (Hollis St. Theatre, Boston, 1893; Broadway Theatre, March 26, 1897)

RINALDO, THE DOCTOR OF FLORENCE. In *Plays and Sonnets*. Phila., 1900. (Castle Square Theatre, Boston, Feb. 25, 1895)

THE RAGGED EARL. With Joseph Humphreys. (Academy of Music, Jan. 16, 1899)

THE BARD OF MARY REDCLIFFE. Phila., 1916.

LEE, HARRY

THE LITTLE POOR MAN. 1922. (Princess Theatre, Aug. 5, 1925)

LLOYD, DAVID DEMAREST

FOR CONGRESS. (Haverley's Theatre, Jan. 10, 1884)

THE WOMAN HATER. 1908. (Denver, Col., July 31, 1886;
Newcastle-on-Tyne, England, Sept. 1, 1887)

THE DOMINIE'S DAUGHTER. (Wallack's Theatre, March, 1887)

THE SENATOR. MS. (Chicago Opera House, Sept. 16, 1889)

LOGAN, (SYKES) OLIVE

SURF. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Jan. 12, 1870)

NEWPORT. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Sept. 18, 1879)

LONG, JOHN LUTHER

MADAME BUTTERFLY. With David Belasco. In Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Herald Square Theatre, March 5, 1900)

THE DARLING OF THE GODS. With David Belasco. MS. (New National Theatre, Washington, D. C., Nov. 17, 1902)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- ADREA. With David Belasco. MS. (Convention Hall, Washington, D. C., Dec. 26, 1904)
THE DRAGON FLY. With E. C. Carpenter. (Garrick Theatre, Phila., 1905)
DOLCE. (Lyric Theatre, Phila., March 24, 1906; Manhattan Theatre, April 24, 1906)
KASSA. (Liberty Theatre, Jan. 23, 1909)
CROWNS. MS. (Provincetown Theatre, Nov. 6, 1922)

MACKAYE, JAMES STEELE

- MONALDI. With Francis Durivage. (St. James Theatre, Jan. 8, 1872)
MARRIAGE. Adap. of JULIE by Octave Feuillet. (St. James Theatre, Feb. 12, 1872)
ARKWRIGHT'S WIFE. With Tom Taylor. (Theatre Royal, Leeds, England, July 7, 1873; Boston Museum, Oct., 1874)
ROSE MICHEL. Adap. from the French of Ernest Blum. (Union Square Theatre, Nov. 23, 1875)
QUEEN AND WOMAN. With J. V. Pritchard. (Brooklyn Theatre, Brooklyn, Feb. 14, 1876)
TWINS. With A. C. Wheeler. (Wallack's Theatre, April 12, 1876)
WON AT LAST. (Wallack's Theatre, Dec. 10, 1877)
THROUGH THE DARK. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, March 10, 1879)
AN IRON WILL. (Low's Opera House, Providence, R. I., Oct. 27, 1879.) Rewritten as HAZEL KIRKE, q.v.
HAZEL KIRKE. Priv. printed, 1880. Revised in Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Madison Square Theatre, Feb. 4, 1880)
A FOOL'S ERRAND. Dram. of *A Fool's Errand*, by Albion W. Tourgée. (Arch St. Theatre, Phila., Oct. 26, 1881)
DAKOLAR. Adap. of LE MAÎTRE DE FORGES, by Georges Ohnet. (Lyceum Theatre, April 6, 1885)
IN SPITE OF ALL. Adap. of ANDREA, by Victorien Sardou. (Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 15, 1885)
RIENZI. Dram. of *Rienzi* by Bulwer Lytton. (Albaugh's Opera House, Washington, D. C., Dec. 13, 1886)
ANARCHY. (Academy of Music, Buffalo, N. Y., May 30, 1887)
Revised as PAUL KAUVAR.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- THE DRAMA OF CIVILIZATION. Pageant. (Madison Square Garden, Nov. 27, 1887)
- PAUL KAUFAR. In *Moses' Representative Plays by American Dramatists*, III. (Standard Theatre, Dec. 24, 1887)
- A NOBLE ROGUE. (Chicago Opera House, Chicago, July 3, 1888)
- AN ARRANT KNAVE. (Chicago Opera House, Chicago, Sept. 30, 1889)
- COLONEL TOM. (Tremont Theatre, Boston, Mass., Jan. 20, 1890)
- MONEY MAD. (Standard Theatre, April 7, 1890.) Revision of
THROUGH THE DARK and A NOBLE ROGUE.

Biographical and Critical

- MacKaye, Percy, "Steele MacKaye, Dynamic Artist of the American Theatre." *The Drama*, No. 4 (Nov., 1911), 138-161, and No. 5 (Feb., 1912), 155-173.
- MacKaye, Percy, *Epoch, the Life of Steele MacKaye*. 2 Vols., 1927 (in press).

MACKAYE, PERCY [WALLACE]

Poems and Plays. 2 Vols. 1916.

Vol. II contains THE CANTERBURY PILGRIMS; JEANNE D'ARC; SAPPHO AND PHAON; THE SCARECROW; and MATER.

A GARLAND TO SYLVIA. 1910. [Written 1896-99]

FENRIS THE WOLF. 1905.

SAINT GAUDENS MASQUE-PROLOGUE. 1909. (Cornish, N. II., June 20, 1905)

JEANNE D'ARC. 1906. (Lyric Theatre, Phila., Oct. 15, 1906; Lyric Theatre, Jan. 28, 1907; Waldorf Theatre, London, April 24, 1907)

SAPPHO AND PHAON. 1907. (Opera House, Providence, R. I., Oct. 14, 1907; Lyric Theatre, Oct. 21, 1907)

MATER. 1908. (Van Ness Theatre, San Francisco, Aug. 3, 1908; Savoy Theatre, Sept. 25, 1908; Playhouse, London, June 4, 1915)

THE CANTERBURY PILGRIMS. 1903. (Park Extension Theatre, Savannah, Ga., April 30, 1909. As the Gloucester Pageant,

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- Gloucester, Mass., Aug. 3, 1909. As an opera, Metropolitan Opera House, March 8, 1917)
- ANTI-MATRIMONY. 1910. (Theatre, Ann Arbor, Mich., March 10, 1910; Garrick Theatre, Sept. 22, 1910)
- THE SCARECROW. 1908. (Middlesex Theatre, Middletown, Conn., Dec. 30, 1910; Garrick Theatre, Jan. 17, 1911; Theatre Royal, Bristol, Eng., Nov. 30, 1914; Deutsches Theater, Berlin, 1914)
- Yankee Fantasies*. 1912. Including * CHUCK (Coburn Players, Oxford, Ohio, July 17, 1912); * GETTYSBURG (Bijou Theatre, Boston, Jan. 3, 1912); * THE ANTICK (Bandbox Theatre, Oct. 4, 1915); * THE CAT-BOAT; * SAM AVERAGE (Toy Theatre, Boston, Feb. 26, 1912)
- A MASQUE OF LABOR. 1912.
- SANCTUARY, A BIRD MASQUE. 1914. (Meriden, N. H., Sept. 12, 1913)
- TOMORROW. 1912. (Little Theatre, Phila., Oct. 31, 1913)
- A THOUSAND YEARS AGO. 1914. (Shubert Theatre, Dec. 1, 1913)
- SAINT LOUIS: A CIVIC MASQUE. 1914. (St. Louis, May 28, 1914)
- THE IMMIGRANTS. 1915.
- THE NEW CITIZENSHIP, A CIVIC RITUAL. 1915. (New York, Feb. 14, 1916)
- CALIBAN, A COMMUNITY MASQUE. 1916. (New York, May 25, 1916)
- THE EVERGREEN TREE. 1917. (Fargo, N. D., Dec. 15, 1917)
- SINBAD THE SAILOR. 1917.
- THE ROLL CALL: A MASQUE OF THE RED CROSS. 1918. (Simultaneously, in different places, Dec. 16, 1918)
- THE WILL OF SONG. With Harry Barnhart. 1919. (Orange, N. J., May 2, 1919)
- RIP VAN WINKLE. 1919. (Auditorium Theatre, Chicago, Jan. 2, 1920)
- WASHINGTON, THE MAN WHO MADE US. 1918. (Belasco Theatre, Washington, D. C., Feb. 23, 1920)
- THIS FINE-PRETTY WORLD. 1924. (Neighborhood Playhouse, Dec. 26, 1923)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- * NAPOLEON CROSSING THE ROCKIES. *Century Magazine*, April, 1924. (Carnegie Institute, Pittsburgh, May 21, 1924)

Biographical and Critical

- MacKaye, Percy, *A Sketch of His Life, with Bibliography of His Works*. Rep. from the Twenty-fifth Anniversary Report of the Class of 1897, Harvard College. 1922.
- MacKaye, Percy, *The Playhouse and the Play*. 1909.
- MacKaye, Percy, *The Civic Theatre*. 1912.
- MacKaye, Percy, *Community Drama*. Boston, 1917.
- MacKaye, Percy, *Epoch, the Life of Steele MacKaye*. 2 Vols. 1927 (in press).
- Dickinson, Thomas H., "The Playwright as Pioneer, Percy MacKaye." *Playwrights of the New American Theater*, pp. 1-55.
- Garnier, M., "M. Percy MacKaye." *La Revue du Mois*, April 10, 1909.
- Russell, Charles E., *Julia Marlowe, Her Life and Art*, 1927, pp. 416-420 and later.

MANSFIELD, RICHARD

- MONSIEUR. (Madison Square Theatre, July 11, 1887)
- DON JUAN. 1891. (Garden Theatre, May 18, 1891)
- THE FIRST VIOLIN. (Meridan Phelps). With J. I. C. Clarke. Dram. of novel by Jessie Fothergill. (Hollis St. Theatre, Boston, April 18, 1898)

Biographical and Critical

- Winter, William, *Life and Art of Richard Mansfield*. 2 Vols. 1910.

MATTHEWS, BRANDER

- MARGERY'S LOVERS. MS. (Royal Court Theatre, London, Feb. 18, 1884; Madison Square Theatre, Jan. 11, 1887)
- A GOLD MINE. With George H. Jessop. c. 1908. (Cincinnati, 1887; Fifth Ave. Theatre, March 4, 1889)
- * THIS PICTURE AND THAT. 1894. (Lyceum Theatre, April 15, 1887)
- ON PROBATION. With George Jessop. MS. (Decatur, Ill., Sept. 9, 1889; Star Theatre, Nov. 19, 1890)
- * IN THE VESTIBULE LIMITED. c. 1892.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

*THE DECISION OF THE COURT. 1893. (Hermann's Theatre, March 23, 1893)

PETER STUYVESANT. With Bronson Howard, q.v.

CUTTYBACK'S THUNDER. Boston, 1902. Adap. of LE SERMENT d'HORACE, by Henri Murger.

Biographical and Critical

Matthews, Brander, *These Many Years: Recollections of a New Yorker*. 1917.

Matthews, Brander, *Comedies for Amateur Acting*. 1880.

For Brander Matthews' Critical Works, see General Bibliography.

MAYO, FRANK

PUDD'N HEAD WILSON. Dram. of story by Mark Twain. MS. (Herald Square Theatre, April 15, 1895)

McCABE, JAMES D., JR.

THE GUERRILLAS. Richmond, 1863. (Richmond Varieties, Dec. 22, 1862)

McEVOY, J. P.

THE POTTERS. (Plymouth Theatre, Dec. 25, 1923)

AMERICAN. (Belmont Theatre, July 26, 1926)

GOD LOVES US. (Maxine Elliott Theatre, Oct. 19, 1926)

McGROARTY, JOHN STEVEN

THE MISSION PLAY. (Mission Theatre, San Gabriel, Calif., April 29, 1912)

McGUIRE, WILLIAM ANTHONY

SIX CYLINDER LOVE. (Harris Theatre, Aug. 25, 1921)

TWELVE MILES OUT. (The Playhouse, Nov. 16, 1925)

IF I WAS RICH. (Eltinge Theatre, Sept. 3, 1926; earlier on road as A GREAT LITTLE GUY)

McINTYRE, JOHN T.

STEVE. (Harris Theatre, Sept. 28, 1912)

A YOUNG MAN'S FANCY. (Playhouse, Oct. 15, 1919)

GENIUS AND THE CROWD. With Francis Hill. (Cohan Theatre, Sept. 6, 1920)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

McLELLAN, C. M. S.

- LEAH KLESCHNA. c. 1920. (Manhattan Theatre, Dec. 12, 1904)
JUDITH ZARAINÉ. (Astor Theatre, Jan. 16, 1911)
* THE FOUNTAIN. (Princess Theatre, Jan. 31, 1914)

MIDDLETON, GEORGE

- * EMBERS [and other one-act plays]. 1911.
* TRADITION [and other one-act plays]. 1913.
* POSSESSION [and other one-act plays]. 1915.
NOWADAYS. 1914.
POLLY WITH A PAST. With Guy Bolton. 1923. (Atlantic City, N. J., June 11, 1917; Belasco Theatre, Sept. 6, 1917)
THE CAVE GIRL. With Guy Bolton. (Atlantic City, N. J., April 7, 1919)
ADAM AND EVA. With Guy Bolton. 1923. (Longacre Theatre, Sept. 13, 1919)
THE OTHER ROSE. Adap. from French of Edouard Bourdet. (Morosco Theatre, Dec. 20, 1923)
THE ROAD TOGETHER. 1916. (Frazee Theatre, Jan. 17, 1924)
* MASKS [and other one-act plays]. 1920.

MILLAY, EDNA ST. VINCENT

- * THE PRINCESS MARRIES THE PAGE. (Provincetown Theatre. 1918)
* ARIA DA CAPO. 1921. (Provincetown Theatre, 1919)
THE LAMP AND THE BELL. 1921.
LAUNZI. Adap. of LAUNZI by Ferenc Molnar. (Plymouth Theatre, Oct. 10, 1923)
THE KING'S HENCHMAN. 1927. (Metropolitan Opera House, Feb. 17, 1927)

MILLER, JOAQUIN

- THE DANITES IN THE SIERRAS. San Francisco, 1882. (Broadway Theatre, Aug. 22, 1877)
FORTY-NINE. San Francisco, 1882. (Haverley's Theatre, Oct. 1, 1881)
AN OREGON IDYLL. In *Poems*, Vol. VI, San Francisco, 1910.
TALLY HO! In *Poems*, Vol. VI, San Francisco, 1910.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

MITCHELL, LANGDON ELWYN

SYLVIAN. In *Sylvian and Other Poems*. 1885.

BECKY SHARP. Dram. Thackeray's novel. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 12, 1899)

THE ADVENTURES OF FRANÇOIS. Dram. novel by S. Weir Mitchell. (Park Theatre, Phila., Oct. 20, 1900)

THE KREUTZER SONATA. Adap. from Yiddish of Jacob Gordin. (Lyric Theatre, Sept. 10, 1906)

THE NEW YORK IDEA. Boston, 1908. (Lyric Theatre, Nov. 19, 1906; Kammerspiel Theater, Berlin, Oct. 7, 1916)

THE NEW MARRIAGE. MS. (Empire Theatre, Syracuse, Oct. 19, 1911)

MAJOR PENDENNIS. Dram. Thackeray's novel. (Atlantic City, N. J., Oct. 11, 1916; Criterion Theatre, Oct. 26, 1916)

Biographical and Critical

Archer, William, Criticism of THE NEW YORK IDEA. *London Tribune*, May 27, 1907, rep. in play as published by W. H. Baker.

Winter, William, *The Wallet of Time*. 1913. II, 273-286. [Becky Sharp]

MOELLER, PHILIP

HELENA'S HUSBAND. 1915. (Bandbox Theatre, Oct. 4, 1915)

* TWO BLIND BEGGARS AND ONE LESS BLIND. 1918. (Bandbox Theatre, 1915)

MADAME SAND. 1920. (Academy of Music, Baltimore, Oct. 29, 1917; Criterion Theatre, Nov. 19, 1917)

Five Somewhat Historical Plays. 1918. Contains: HELENA'S HUSBAND; THE LITTLE SUPPER; SISTERS OF SUSANNAH; THE ROADHOUSE IN ARDEN; POKEY; OR, THE BEAUTIFUL LEGEND OF THE AMOROUS INDIAN.

MOLIÈRE. 1919. (Ford's Theatre, Baltimore, Feb. 24, 1919; Liberty Theatre, March 17, 1919)

SOPHIE. 1919. (Greenwich Village Theatre, March 2, 1919)

MOODY, WILLIAM VAUGHN

Collected Edition: *Poems and Plays*. 2 Vols. Boston, 1912. Intro. by John M. Manly. [Important]

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

VOL. I: THE FIRE BRINGER; THE MASQUE OF JUDGMENT;
THE DEATH OF EVE.

VOL. II: THE GREAT DIVIDE; THE FAITH HEALER.

THE MASQUE OF JUDGMENT. Boston, 1900.

THE FIRE BRINGER. Boston, 1904.

THE GREAT DIVIDE. 1909. (Garrick Theatre, Chicago, April 12, 1906, as A SABINE WOMAN; Princess Theatre, Oct. 3, 1906; Adelphi Theatre, London, Sept. 15, 1909)

THE FAITH HEALER. Boston, 1909; 1910 (revised) (Century Theatre, St. Louis, March 15, 1909; Savoy Theatre, Jan. 19, 1910)

THE DEATH OF EVE. In *Poems and Plays*, Vol. I.

Biographical and Critical

Barr, Nash O., "The Lyrist and Lyric Dramatist." *The Drama*, No. 2 (May, 1911), 177-206.

Caffin, C. H., "The Playwright." *The Drama*, No. 2 (May, 1911), 206-211.

Mason, Daniel Gregory, *Some Letters of William Vaughn Moody*. Boston, 1913.

Sinclair, May, "Three American Poets of To-Day." *Atlantic Monthly*, XCVIII (1906), 326-335.

Wolf, Rennold, In *N. Y. Telegraph*, Jan. 20, 1910. [Faith Healer]

MURDOCH, FRANK HITCHCOCK

DAVY CROCKETT. MS. (Rochester, N. Y., Nov. 1872; Wood's Museum, June 2, 1873)

ONLY A JEW. (Globe Theatre, Boston, Feb. 24, 1873)

NICHOLS, ANNE

THE GILDED CAGE. (Morosco Theatre, Los Angeles, Calif., Dec. 12, 1920)

JUST MARRIED. With Adelaide Mathews. (Comedy Theatre, April 26, 1921)

ABIE'S IRISH ROSE. (Morosco Theatre, Los Angeles, Calif. March 5, 1922; Fulton Theatre, May 23, 1922; London, April 11, 1927)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

Biographical and Critical

Nichols, Anne, "The Story of Abie's Irish Rose." *Theatre*, XL, (July, 1924), 19, 54.

O'HIGGINS, HARVEY

THE ARGYLE CASE. With Harriet Ford, q.v.

POLYGAMY. With Harriet Ford, q.v.

MR. LAZARUS. With Harriet Ford. c. 1926. (Shubert Theatre, Sept. 5, 1916)

O'NEILL, EUGENE GLADSTONE

The Complete Works of Eugene O'Neill. 2 Vols. 1924.

Vol. I: ANNA CHRISTIE, BEYOND THE HORIZON, THE FIRST MAN, DIFF'RENT, GOLD, THE MOON OF THE CARIBBEES, BOUND EAST FOR CARDIFF, THE LONG VOYAGE HOME, IN THE ZONE, and ILE.

Vol. II: THE EMPEROR JONES, THE HAIRY APE, ALL GOD'S CHILLUN GOT WINGS, DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS, WELDED, THE STRAW, THE ROPE, THE DREAMY KID, WHERE THE CROSS IS MADE, and BEFORE BREAKFAST.

* BOUND EAST FOR CARDIFF. In *Provincetown Plays*, First Series, 1916. (Wharf Theatre, Provincetown, Mass., Summer, 1916; also London, Liverpool, etc.)

* THIRST. Boston, 1914. (Wharf Theatre, Provincetown, Mass., Summer, 1916)

* THE WEB. In *Thirst and Other Plays*. Boston, 1914.

* WARNINGS. In *Thirst and Other Plays*. Boston, 1914.

* RECKLESSNESS. In *Thirst and Other Plays*. Boston, 1914.

* BEFORE BREAKFAST. In *Provincetown Plays*, Third Series, 1916. (Playwrights' Theatre, Dec. 1, 1916)

* FOG. In *Thirst and Other Plays*. Boston, 1914. (Playwrights' Theatre, Jan., 1917)

* THE SNIPER. (Playwrights' Theatre, Feb. 16, 1917)

* IN THE ZONE. In *The Moon of the Caribbees and Six Other Plays of the Sea*. 1919. (Comedy Theatre, Oct. 31, 1917; Everyman Theatre, London, June 15, 1921; also Prague, 1924-5)

* THE LONG VOYAGE HOME. In *The Smart Set*, LIII (Oct., 1917), 83-94. (Playwrights' Theatre, Nov. 2, 1917; also London, Liverpool)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- * ILE. In *The Smart Set*, LV (May, 1918), 89-100. (Playwrights' Theatre, Nov. 30, 1917; also Everyman Theatre, London, April 17, 1922; Rome, etc.)
- * THE ROPE. In *The Moon of the Caribbees and Six Other Plays of the Sea*. 1919. (Playwrights' Theatre, April 26, 1918)
- * WHERE THE CROSS IS MADE. In *The Moon of the Caribbees and Six Other Plays of the Sea*. 1919. (Playwrights' Theatre, Nov. 22, 1918)
- * THE MOON OF THE CARIBBEES. In *The Smart Set*, LV (Aug., 1918), 73-86. Rep. in *The Moon of the Caribbees and Six Other Plays of the Sea*. 1919. (Playwrights' Theatre, Dec. 20, 1918; Volksbühne, Berlin, 1924; also Kiel, Hamburg)
- * THE DREAMY KID. In *Theatre Arts Magazine*, IV (Jan., 1920), 41-56. (Playwrights' Theatre, Oct. 31, 1919)
- BEYOND THE HORIZON. 1920. (Morosco Theatre, Feb. 2, 1920; Repertory Theatre, London, 1926; also Tokio, Japan)
- CHRIS CHRISTOPHERSON. (Atlantic City, N. J., March 8, 1920)
- * EXORCISM. (Playwrights' Theatre, March 26, 1920)
- THE EMPEROR JONES. *Theatre Arts Magazine*, V (Jan., 1921), 29-59. Rep. in *The Emperor Jones, Diff'rent, The Straw*. 1921. (Playwrights' Theatre, Nov. 1, 1920; also London; Odéon, Paris, Oct. 30, 1923; Berlin, 1924; Prague, 1924-5; Tokio; Italy; Dublin, Jan. 1927)
- DIFF'RENT. In *The Emperor Jones, Diff'rent, The Straw*. 1921. (Playwrights' Theatre, Dec. 27, 1920; Everyman Theatre, London, Oct. 4, 1921; also Dublin; Rotterdam)
- GOLD. 1920. (Frazee Theatre, June 1, 1921)
- ANNA CHRISTIE. In *The Hairy Ape, Anna Christie, The First Man*, 1922. (Vanderbilt Theatre, Nov. 2, 1921; Strand Theatre, London, April 10, 1923; Deutsches Theater, Berlin, Oct. 10, 1923; Sweden, Norway, Denmark, 1923; Barcelona, Vienna, Moscow, 1924; also a tour in Italy; coast cities in Orient)
- THE STRAW. In *Emperor Jones, Diff'rent, The Straw*. 1921. (Greenwich Village Theatre, Nov. 10, 1921)
- THE FIRST MAN. In *The Hairy Ape, Anna Christie, The First Man*. 1922. (Neighborhood Playhouse, March 4, 1922)
- THE HAIRY APE. In *The Hairy Ape, Anna Christie, The First Man*. 1922. (Playwrights' Theatre, March 9, 1922;

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- Freie Bühne, Berlin, Nov. 1, 1924; Kammeny Theatre, Moscow, 1924; Prague; Melbourne; Italy; London)
- WELDED. In *Complete Works*, Vol. II. 1924. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, March 17, 1924)
- THE ANCIENT MARINER. Dram. of poem by Coleridge. (Provincetown Playhouse, April 6, 1924)
- ALL GOD'S CHILLUN GOT WINGS. In *American Mercury*, I (Feb., 1924), 129-148. (Provincetown Playhouse, May 15, 1924)
- DESIRE UNDER THE ELMS. In *Complete Works*. Vol. II. 1924. (Greenwich Village Theatre, Nov. 11, 1924; Stavovske Theatre, Prague, Oct. 4, 1925; Berlin)
- THE FOUNTAIN. In *The Great God Brown, The Fountain*, etc., 1926. (Greenwich Village Theatre, Dec. 10, 1925)
- THE GREAT GOD BROWN. In *The Great God Brown, The Fountain*, etc., 1926. (Greenwich Village Theatre, Jan. 23, 1926)
- MARCO MILLIONS. 1927.
- LAZARUS LAUGHED. 1927.

Biographical and Critical

- O'Neill, Eugene, "Strindberg and Our Theatre." *Program of the Provincetown Theatre*, No. 1, 1923-4.
- Anonymous, "O'Neill's Plays Abroad." *Program of the Greenwich Village Theatre*, Season 1925-6.
- Baughan, E. A., *Fortnightly*, CXIII (May, 1923), 852-860.
- Bone, David W., "The Sea Across the Footlights." *New York Times Book Review*, Jan. 15, 1922.
- Clark, Barrett H., *Eugene O'Neill*. 1926. [Indispensable. Complete Bibliography and Lists of Plays to 1926]
- Eaton, Walter Prichard, "Eugene O'Neill as a Dramatist." *Theatre Arts Magazine*, IV (Oct., 1920), 286-289.
- Hamilton, Clayton, *Conversations on Contemporary Drama*. 1924, pp. 198-218.
- Hayes, J. J., "An Irish Emperor Jones." *New York Times*, Feb. 12, 1927.
- Quinn, A. H., "Eugene O'Neill, Poet and Mystic," *Scribner's Magazine*, LXXX (Oct., 1926), 368-372.
- Sayler, Oliver M., *Our American Theatre*, 1923, pp. 27-43.
- Woollcott, Alexander, *Shouts and Murmurs*, 1922, pp. 144-170.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

PARKER, LOTTIE BLAIR

WAY DOWN EAST. Priv. printed, 1899. (Manhattan Theatre, Jan. 19, 1898)

PATTERSON, J. MEDILL

THE FOURTH ESTATE. MS. (Wallack's Theatre, Oct. 8, 1909)
A LITTLE BROTHER TO THE RICH. With Harriet Ford. Dram.
of novel by Patterson. (Wallack's Theatre, Dec. 27, 1909)
REBELLION. MS. (Maxine Elliott Theatre, Oct. 3, 1911)

PEABODY, JOSEPHINE PRESTON (Mrs. Lionel Marks)

FORTUNE AND MEN'S EYES. Boston, 1900.
MARLOWE. Boston, 1901. (Radcliffe College, 1905)
THE WINGS. In *Harper's Magazine*, CX (May, 1905), 947-956.
Rep. c. 1917. (Toy Theatre, Boston, Jan. 15, 1912)
THE PIPER. Boston, 1910. (Stratford Memorial Theatre, England, July 26, 1910; New Theatre, Jan. 30, 1911)
THE WOLF OF GUBBIO. Boston, 1913.
THE CHAMELEON. c. 1917.
THE PORTRAIT OF MRS. W— Boston, 1922.

Biographical and Critical

Baker, Christina Hopkinson. Ed., *Diary and Letters of Josephine Preston Peabody*. Boston, 1925.

POLLOCK, CHANNING

THE FOOL. 1923. (Times Square Theatre, Oct. 23, 1922)
THE ENEMY. 1925. (Shubert Theatre, New Haven, Conn., June 1, 1925)

RICE, (REIZENSTEIN) ELMER E.

ON TRIAL. c. 1919. (Candler Theatre, Aug. 19, 1914)
FOR THE DEFENCE. (Playhouse, Dec. 19, 1919)
WAKE UP, JONATHAN! With Hatcher Hughes, q.v.
THE ADDING MACHINE. (Garrick Theatre, March 19, 1923)

RICHMAN, ARTHUR

NOT SO LONG AGO, New York, n. d. (Globe Theatre, Atlantic City, N. J., Feb. 29, 1920; Booth Theatre, May 4, 1920)
AMBUSH. 1922. (Garrick Theatre, Oct. 10, 1921)
A SERPENT'S TOOTH. (Asbury Park, N. J., July 31, 1922)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

THE AWFUL TRUTH. (Henry Miller Theatre, Sept. 18, 1922)

A PROUD WOMAN. (Maxine Elliott Theatre, Nov. 14, 1926)

ROBSON, ELEANOR

IN THE NEXT ROOM. With Harriet Ford. Dram. of story by
B. E. Stevenson. c. 1925. (Vanderbilt Theatre, Nov. 27,
1923)

ROYLE, EDWIN MILTON

FRIENDS. MS. (Standard Theatre, May 9, 1892)

CAPTAIN IMPUDENCE. (American Theatre, Jan. 4, 1897; first
produced as MEXICO, Euclid Ave. Opera House, Cleveland,
Ohio, Aug. 26, 1895)

1+1=3; OR, THE SINS OF THE FATHERS. (Garrick Theatre,
March 1, 1897)

MY WIFE'S HUSBANDS. (Madison Square Theatre, Aug. 24,
1903)

THE SQUAW MAN. MS. (Star Theatre, Buffalo, April 24, 1905;
Wallack's Theatre, Oct. 23, 1905; Lyric Theatre, London,
Jan. 11, 1908 as THE WHITE MAN)

MARRYING MARY. Musical version of MY WIFE'S HUSBANDS.
(Daly's Theatre, Sept. 3, 1906)

CLEO. (Park Theatre, Boston, April 22, 1907)

THE STRUGGLE EVERLASTING. MS. (Opera House, Providence,
R. I., Sept. 23, 1907; Hackett Theatre, Sept. 26, 1907)

THE UNWRITTEN LAW. MS. (Fulton Theatre, Feb. 7, 1913)

AFTERMATH. (Atlantic City, N. J., March 22, 1920)

LAUNCELOT AND ELAINE. MS. (Greenwich Village Theatre,
Sept. 14, 1921)

THE CONQUEROR. (Union Square Theatre, June 18, 1923)

HER WAY OUT. (Gaiety Theatre, June 23, 1924)

SABINE, LILLIAN

THE RISE OF SILAS LAPHAM. Dram. of novel by W. D. Howells.
(Garrick Theatre, Nov. 25, 1919)

SHELDON, EDWARD

SALVATION NELL. MS. (Opera House, Providence, R. I., Nov.
12, 1908; Hackett Theatre, Nov. 17, 1908)

THE NIGGER. 1910. (New Theatre, Dec. 4, 1909)

THE BOSS. In Quinn's *Representative American Plays*. (Gar-

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- rick Theatre, Detroit, Mich., Jan. 9, 1911; Astor Theatre, Jan. 30, 1911)
- PRINCESS ZIM-ZIM. MS. (Harmanus Bleecker Hall, Albany, Dec. 4, 1911)
- EGYPT. Priv. printed, 1912. (The Playhouse, Hudson, N. Y., Sept. 18, 1912)
- THE HIGH ROAD. Priv. printed, 1912. (His Majesty's Theatre, Montreal, Oct. 14, 1912; Hudson Theatre, Nov. 19, 1912)
- ROMANCE. 1914. (Harmanus Bleecker Hall, Albany, Feb. 6, 1913; Maxine Elliott Theatre, Feb. 10, 1913; Devonshire Park Theatre, Eastbourne, Sept. 30, 1915)
- THE SONG OF SONGS. Priv. printed, 1914. Dram. of Hermann Sudermann's *Das Hohe Lied*. (Atlantic City, N. J., Oct. 29, 1914; Eltinge Theatre, Dec. 22, 1914)
- THE GARDEN OF PARADISE. 1915. (Park Theatre, Nov. 28, 1914)
- ALICE IN WONDERLAND. MS., dated 1916.
- THE LONELY HEART. MS. (Baltimore, Oct. 24, 1921)
- BEWITCHED. With Sidney Howard. MS. (Allentown, Pa., Sept. 26, 1924)
- LULU BELLE. With Charles MacArthur. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Jan. 26, 1926)

SMITH, WINCHELL

- BREWSTER'S MILLIONS. With Byron Ongley. Dram. of novel by George Barr McCutcheon. c. 1925. (New Amsterdam Theatre, Dec. 31, 1906)
- THE FORTUNE HUNTER. c. 1909. (Gaiety Theatre, Sept. 4, 1909)
- THE ONLY SON. MS. (Gaiety Theatre, Oct. 16, 1911)
- THE BOOMERANG. With Victor Mapes. c. 1915. (Playhouse, Wilmington, Del., April 5, 1915; Belasco Theatre, Aug. 10, 1915)
- TURN TO THE RIGHT. With John E. Hazzard. c. 1916. (Gaiety Theatre, Aug. 18, 1916)
- LIGHTNIN'. With Frank Bacon. c. 1918. (Gaiety Theatre, Aug. 26, 1918)
- THANK YOU. With Tom Cushing. c. 1922. (Longacre Theatre, Oct. 3, 1921)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

STALLINGS, LAURENCE

WHAT PRICE GLORY. With Maxwell Anderson, q.v.

FIRST FLIGHT. With Maxwell Anderson, q.v.

THE BUCCANEER. With Maxwell Anderson, q. v.

DEEP RIVER. (Shubert Theatre, Phila., Sept. 21, 1926)

STEVENSON, CHRISTINE WETHERILL

THE PILGRIMAGE PLAY. (Pilgrimage Theatre, Hollywood, Calif., June 28, 1920)

STODDARD, LORIMER

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE. MS. (Herald Square Theatre, Oct. 27, 1894)

IN THE PALACE OF THE KING. With F. Marion Crawford, q.v.

STRONG, AUSTIN

BUNNY. (Hudson Theatre, Jan. 4, 1916)

THREE WISE FOOLS. Ottawa, 1919. (Criterion Theatre, Oct. 31, 1918)

SEVENTH HEAVEN. c. 1922. (Booth Theatre, Oct. 30, 1922; as HEAVEN, Garrick Theatre, Detroit, Mich., June 7, 1920)

SULLIVAN, THOMAS RUSSELL

DR. JEKYLL AND MR. HYDE. Dram. of novel by R. L. Stevenson. (Boston Museum, May 9, 1887)

NERO. (Garden Theatre, Sept. 21, 1891)

TARKINGTON, NEWTON BOOTH

MONSIEUR BEAUCAIRE. With E. G. Sutherland. Dram. of *Monsieur Beaucaire*, by Tarkington. In Pence's *Dramas by Present-Day Writers*. c. 1927. (Garrick Theatre, Phila., Oct. 7, 1901; Herald Square Theatre, Dec. 2, 1901)

THE MAN FROM HOME. With Harry Leon Wilson. 1908. (Studebaker Theatre, Chicago, Sept. 29, 1907; Astor Theatre, Aug. 17, 1908)

YOUR HUMBLE SERVANT. With Harry Leon Wilson. (Lyceum Theatre, Rochester, N. Y., Oct. 8, 1909; Garrick Theatre, Jan. 3, 1910)

CAMEO KIRBY. (Hackett Theatre, Dec. 20, 1909)

GETTING A POLISH. With H. L. Wilson. (Wallack's Theatre, Nov. 7, 1910)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- * BEAUTY AND THE JACOBIN. 1912. (Comedy Theatre, Nov. 29, 1912)
- THE OHIO LADY. Priv. printed, 1916. (Hartman Theatre, Columbus, O., Jan. 24, 1916) Rev. as THE COUNTRY COUSIN.
- MR. ANTONIO. (Star Theatre, Buffalo, Sept. 11, 1916; Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 18, 1916)
- THE COUNTRY COUSIN. With Julian Street. c. 1921. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., April 23, 1917) See THE OHIO LADY.
- THE GIBSON UPRIGHT. With H. L. Wilson. Garden City. 1919.
- CLARENCE. c. 1921. (Apollo Theatre, Atlantic City, N. J., July 7, 1919; Hudson Theatre, Sept. 20, 1919)
- UP FROM NOWHERE. With H. L. Wilson. (Comedy Theatre, Sept. 8, 1919)
- POLDKIN. (New Haven, Feb. 23, 1920; Park Theatre, Sept. 9, 1920)
- THE WREN. c. 1922. (Gaiety Theatre, Oct. 10, 1921)
- THE INTIMATE STRANGERS. c. 1921. (Henry Miller Theatre, Nov. 7, 1921)
- ROSE BRIAR. (Empire Theatre, Dec. 25, 1922)
- TWEEDLES. With H. L. Wilson. 1924. (Frazee Theatre, Aug. 13, 1923)
- MAGNOLIA. (Liberty Theatre, Aug. 27, 1923)
- BIMBO THE PIRATE. 1926.

Biographical and Critical

- Dickinson, Asa Don, *Booth Tarkington, A Sketch*. Garden City, 1926.
- Winter, William, *Life and Art of Richard Mansfield*, II, 149-154. [Beaucaire]

THOMAS, ALBERT ELLSWORTH

- HER HUSBAND'S WIFE. 1914. (Broad St. Theatre, Phila., Feb. 14, 1910; Garrick Theatre, April 9, 1910; New Theatre, London, Sept. 5, 1916)
- THIRTY DAYS. With Clayton Hamilton. 1923. (Cort Theatre, Chicago, March 9, 1910)
- WHAT THE DOCTOR ORDERED. (Astor Theatre, Sept. 20, 1911)
- LITTLE BOY BLUE. Adap. of LORD PICCOLO by Rudolph

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- Schanzer and Carl Lindau. (Fulton Opera House, Lancaster, Pa., Nov. 9, 1911)
- THE RAINBOW. c. 1919. (Liberty Theatre, March 11, 1912)
- THE BIG IDEA. With Clayton Hamilton. c. 1917. (Globe Theatre, Nov. 16, 1914; first, as WANTED \$22,000, Apollo Theatre, Atlantic City, N. J., June 22, 1914)
- COME OUT OF THE KITCHEN. Dram. of novel by Alice Duer Miller. c. 1921. (Columbia Theatre, San Francisco, Aug. 14, 1916; Cohan Theatre, Oct. 23, 1916)
- THE BETTER UNDERSTANDING. With Clayton Hamilton. Boston, 1924. (Columbia Theatre, San Francisco, May, 1917)
- THE MATINEE HERO. (Vanderbilt Theatre, Oct. 7, 1918)
- JUST SUPPOSE. c. 1923. (Academy, Baltimore, Md., May 17, 1920; Henry Miller Theatre, Nov. 1, 1920)
- THE CHAMPION. With Thomas Loudon. c. 1922. (Longacre Theatre, Jan. 3, 1921)
- ONLY THIRTY-EIGHT. Dram. of short story by W. P. Eaton. c. 1922. (Cort Theatre, Sept. 13, 1921)
- THE FRENCH DOLL. Adap. from French of Armont and Gerbiddon. (Lyceum Theatre, Feb. 20, 1922)
- THE JOLLY ROGER. (National Theatre, Aug. 30, 1923)
- SPINDRIFT. Adap. of LE DEMI-MONDE, by Alexander Dumas, fils. (Park Theatre, Boston, March 9, 1925)
- LOST. With G. A. Chamberlain, from novel by him. (Mansfield Theatre, March 28, 1927)

THOMAS, AUGUSTUS

- ALONE. (Marion Place Dramatic Club, Moberly, Mo., 1875)
- THE BIG RISE. (Pickwick Theatre, St. Louis, 1882)
- * EDITHA'S BURGLAR. Dram. of story by Frances Hodgson Burnett. MS. (McCullough Dramatic Club, St. Louis, 1883; Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 19, 1887)
- * A NEW YEAR'S CALL. (Pope's Theatre, St. Louis, 1883)
- * A MAN OF THE WORLD. MS. (Pope's Theatre, St. Louis, 1883; Madison Square Theatre, Oct. 30, 1889)
- * A LEAF FROM THE WOODS. (Pope's Theatre, St. Louis, 1883)
- * A STUDIO PICTURE. (Pope's Theatre, St. Louis, 1883)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- COMBUSTION. With Edgar Smith. (Opera House, Mexico, Mo., 1884)
- THE BURGLAR. (Park Theatre, Boston, June 17, 1889; Madison Square Theatre, July 1, 1889)
- * A WOMAN OF THE WORLD. (Star Theatre, Aug. 4, 1890)
- RECKLESS TEMPLE. (Standard Theatre, Oct. 27, 1890)
- * AFTERTHOUGHTS. (Madison Square Theatre, Nov. 24, 1890)
- ALABAMA. 1898. (Madison Square Theatre, April 1, 1891; Garrick Theatre, London, Sept. 2, 1895)
- A NIGHT'S FROLIC. From the German. (Union Square Theatre, June 10, 1891)
- FOR MONEY. With Clay M. Greene. (Cleveland, O., Dec., 1891; Star Theatre, Jan. 12, 1892)
- COLONEL CARTER OF CARTERVILLE. Dram. of novelette by F. Hopkinson Smith. (Palmer's Theatre, March 22, 1892)
- * THE HOLLY TREE INN. (Union Square Theatre, April 11, 1892)
- SURRENDER. MS. (Columbia Theatre, Boston, Nov. 21, 1892)
- * A PROPER IMPROPRIETY. (Union Square Theatre, 1893?)
- IN MIZZOURA. c. 1916. (Hooley's Theatre, Chicago, Aug. 7, 1893; Fifth Ave. Theatre, Sept. 4, 1893)
- NEW BLOOD. (McVicker's Theatre, Chicago, July 26, 1894; Palmer's [Broadway] Theatre, Sept. 19, 1894)
- * THE MUSIC BOX. (Lambs Club, 1894)
- * THE MAN UPSTAIRS. Washington, D. C., 1918. Rep. in *One Act Plays for Stage and Study*, 1924. (Hoyt's Theatre, April 9, 1895)
- THE CAPITOL. MS. (Standard Theatre, Sept. 9, 1895)
- CHIMMIE FADDEN. Dram. of story by E. W. Townsend. (Garden Theatre, Jan. 13, 1896)
- THE JUCKLINS. Dram. of story by Opie Read. (1896?)
- THE HOOSIER DOCTOR. MS. (New National Theatre, Washington, D. C., April 22, 1897; Fourteenth St. Theatre, April 18, 1898)
- * THAT OVERCOAT. (Hoyt's Theatre, Jan. 7, 1898)
- DON'T TELL HER HUSBAND. (Columbia Theatre, San Francisco, 1898)
- THE MEDDLER. (Wallack's Theatre, Sept. 1, 1898.) Earlier as DON'T TELL HER HUSBAND.

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- COLONEL GEORGE OF MOUNT VERNON.** (Castle Square Theatre, Boston, Dec. 12, 1898)
- THE BONNIE BRIAR BUSH.** Dram. of novel by Ian Maclaren. (1898?)
- ARIZONA.** 1899. (Hamlin's Grand Opera House, Chicago, June 12, 1899; Herald Square, Sept. 10, 1900; Adelphi Theatre, London, Feb. 3, 1902)
- OLIVER GOLDSMITH.** c. 1916. (Empire Theatre, Albany, Nov. 30, 1899; Fifth Ave. Theatre, March 19, 1900)
- ON THE QUIET.** MS. (Madison Square Theatre, Feb. 11, 1901; Comedy Theatre, London, Sept. 27, 1905)
- CHAMPAGNE CHARLEY.** (Aug., 1901)
- COLORADO.** (Wallack's Theatre, Nov. 18, 1901)
- SOLDIERS OF FORTUNE.** Adap. of play by R. H. Davis, based on novel. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Conn., Feb. 17, 1902; Savoy Theatre, March 17, 1902)
- THE EARL OF PAWTUCKET.** c. 1917. (Madison Square Theatre, Feb. 5, 1903; Playhouse, London, June 25, 1907)
- THE OTHER GIRL.** c. 1917. (Criterion Theatre, Dec. 29, 1903)
- MRS. LEFFINGWELL'S BOOTS.** c. 1916. (Savoy Theatre, Jan. 11, 1905)
- THE EDUCATION OF MR. PIPP.** Dram. of pictures by C. D. Gibson. MS. (Liberty Theatre, Feb. 20, 1905)
- DELANCEY.** (Empire Theatre, Sept. 4, 1905)
- THE EMBASSY BALL.** (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Conn., Oct. 16, 1905; Daly's Theatre, March 5, 1906)
- THE RANGER.** (Wallack's Theatre, Sept. 2, 1907)
- THE MEMBER FROM OZARK.** (Opera House, Detroit, 1907)
- THE WITCHING HOUR.** c. 1916. (Providence, R. I., Nov. 16, 1907; Hackett Theatre, Nov. 18, 1907)
- THE MATINEE IDOL.** Adap. of Bernard's *HIS LAST LEGS*, as a musical comedy. (Daly's Theatre, April 28, 1909)
- THE HARVEST MOON.** c. 1922. (Garrick Theatre, Oct. 18, 1909)
- AS A MAN THINKS.** 1911. (Hyperion Theatre, New Haven, Conn., March 4, 1911; Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, March 13, 1911)
- THE MODEL.** (Illinois Theatre, Chicago, April 8, 1912, as *WHEN IT COMES HOME*; Harris Theatre, Aug. 31, 1912)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

- MERE MAN. (Harris Theatre, Nov. 25, 1912)
- AT BAY. With George Scarborough. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, Oct. 7, 1913)
- INDIAN SUMMER. MS. (Buffalo, Sept. 29, 1913; Criterion Theatre, Oct. 27, 1913)
- THREE OF HEARTS. (Thirty-ninth St. Theatre, 1913)
- THE BATTLE CRY. Dram. of novel by Charles Neville Buck. (Lyric Theatre, Oct. 31, 1914)
- THE NIGHTINGALE. (1914)
- RIO GRANDE. (Lyric Theatre, Allentown, Pa., Feb. 26, 1916; Empire Theatre, April 4, 1916)
- THE COPPERHEAD. In Cohen's *Longer Plays by Modern Authors*. Rep. with Int. by Thomas. c. 1922. (Parson's Theatre, Hartford, Conn., Jan. 22, 1918; Shubert Theatre, Feb. 18, 1918)
- PALMY DAYS. (Playhouse, Oct. 27, 1919)
- SPEAK OF THE DEVIL. AS THE BLUE DEVIL, Academy of Music, Baltimore, Md., May 10, 1920; Broad St. Theatre, Phila., May 17, 1920)
- *THE TENT OF POMPEY. (1920)
- NEMESIS. (Garriek Theatre, Phila., March 21, 1921; Hudson Theatre, April 4, 1921)
- STILL WATERS. 1926. Belasco Theatre, Washington, D. C., Sept. 7, 1925)

Biographical and Critical

- Thomas, Augustus, Introduction to *The Autobiography of a Play*, by Bronson Howard, q.v.
- Thomas's Introductions, prefaced to the acting editions of his plays, published by Samuel French, contain valuable chapters in dramatic technique.
- Thomas, Augustus, *The Print of My Remembrance*. 1922. [Authoritative autobiography]
- Winter, William, *The Wallet of Time*, II, 529-557. [Important]
- Howells, W. D., *North American Review*, CXXII (March, 1901), 474. [Arizona]
- Scott, Clement, *Free Lance* (London), Feb. 15, 1902. [Arizona]

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

THOMPSON, DENMAN

JOSHUA WHITCOMB. (As variety sketch, Harry Martin's Varieties, Pittsburgh, Feb., 1875; as full-length play, with George W. Ryer, National Theatre, April 3, 1876)

THE OLD HOMESTEAD. With George W. Ryer. (Boston Museum, April 5, 1886; Fourteenth St. Theatre, Jan. 10, 1887)

THE TWO SISTERS. With George W. Ryer. (Boston Theatre, Sept. 3, 1887)

THE SUNSHINE OF PARADISE ALLEY. With George W. Ryer. (Fourteenth St. Theatre, May 11, 1896)

OUR NEW MINISTER. With George W. Ryer. c. 1900. (1893?)

TOTHEROH, DAN

WILD BIRDS. 1925. (Cherry Lane Playhouse, April 9, 1925)

TRIPLET, JAMES [REYNOLDS, W. H.]

A SUPPER IN DIXIE. 1865. (McVicker's Theatre, Chicago, 1865?)

TROMBLY, ALBERT EDMUND

MASQUE OF AMERICAN DRAMA. Philadelphia, 1917. (University of Pennsylvania, May, 1917)

TULLY, RICHARD WALTON

THE ROSE OF THE RANCHO. With David Belasco, q.v.

THE BIRD OF PARADISE. MS. (Daly's Theatre, Jan. 8, 1912)

OMAR THE TENTMAKER. MS. (Lyric Theatre, Jan. 13, 1914)

THE FLAME. MS. (Lyric Theatre, Sept. 4, 1916)

TWAIN, MARK

THE GILDED AGE. With G. S. Densmore. (California Theatre, San Francisco, April 23, 1874; Park Theatre, Sept. 16, 1874)

AH SIN. With Bret Harte, q.v.

THE AMERICAN CLAIMANT; OR, MULBERRY SELLERS TEN YEARS LATER. With W. D. Howells. (Lyceum Theatre, Sept. 23, 1887)

Biographical and Critical

Howells, W. D., For criticism of Colonel Sellers see "Drama," *Atlantic Monthly*, XXXV (June, 1875), 749-751.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

MATTHEWS, BRANDER, "Mark Twain and the Theater." In *Playwrights on Playmaking*. 1923.

PAINE, ALBERT BIGELOW, *Mark Twain, a Biography*. 3 Vols., 1912. [Authoritative biography]

VARESI, GILDA

ENTER MADAME. With Dolly Byrne. 1921. (Garriek Theatre, Aug. 16, 1920)

VEILLER, BAYARD

WITHIN THE LAW. c. 1917. (Princess Theatre, Chicago, April 6, 1912; Eltinge Theatre, Sept. 11, 1912)

VOLLMER, LULA

SUN-UP. 1925. (Provincetown Theatre, May 24, 1923; Vaudeville Theatre, London, May 4, 1925)

THE SHAME WOMAN. (Greenwich Village Theatre, Oct. 16, 1923)

THE DUNCE BOY. (Daly's Theatre, April 3, 1925)

WALLACK, LESTER

THE ROMANCE OF A POOR YOUNG MAN. Adap. of LE ROMAN D'UN JEUNE HOMME PAUVRE, by Octave Feuillet. (Wallack's Lyceum, Jan. 24, 1860)

CENTRAL PARK; OR, THE HOUSE WITH TWO DOORS. (Wallack's Lyceum, Feb. 14, 1861)

ROSEDALE; OR, THE RIFLE BALL. Priv. printed, 1890. (Wallack's Theatre, Sept. 30, 1863)

WALTER, EUGENE

SERGEANT JAMES. (Boston Theatre, Aug. 30, 1902). Rev. as BOOTS AND SADDLES.

THE UNDERTOW. (Harlem Opera House, April 22, 1907)

PAID IN FULL. (Montreal, first; Astor Theatre, Feb. 25, 1908)

THE WOLF. (Bijou Theatre, April 18, 1908)

THE EASIEST WAY. Priv. printed, 1908. (Parson's Theatre, Hartford, Conn., Dec. 31, 1908; Stuyvesant Theatre, Jan. 19, 1909)

JUST A WIFE. (Colonial Theatre, Cleveland, O., Jan. 17, 1910; Belasco Theatre, Jan. 31, 1910)

BOOTS AND SADDLES. (Albany, Oct. 17, 1910)

A HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN DRAMA

- THE TRAIL OF THE LONESOME PINE. Dram. of novel by John Fox, Jr. (New Amsterdam Theatre, Jan. 29, 1912)
- FINE FEATHERS. MS. (Cort Theatre, Chicago, Aug. 12, 1912; Astor Theatre, Jan. 7, 1913)
- JUST A WOMAN. (Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Jan. 17, 1916)
- THE LITTLE SHEPHERD OF KINGDOM COME. Dram. of novel by John Fox, Jr. (Belasco Theatre, Washington, D. C., April 3, 1916)
- THE KNIFE. (Bijou Theatre, April 12, 1917)
- THE ASSASSIN. (New Haven, Conn., May 31, 1917)
- NANCY LEE. With H. C. Wilson. (Hudson Theatre, April 9, 1918)
- THE CHALLENGE. (Selwyn Theatre, Aug. 5, 1919)
- THE MAN'S NAME. With Marjorie Chase. (Republic Theatre, Nov. 15, 1921)

Biographical and Critical

Walter, Eugene, *How to Write a Play*. 1925.

WATKINS, MAURINE

CHICAGO. (Music Box Theatre, Dec. 30, 1926)

WILLIAMS, JESSE LYNCH

- THE STOLEN STORY. Dram. of story by author. Rewritten as novel, *The Day Dreamer*, 1906. (Providence, R. I., April 30, 1906; Garden Theatre, Oct. 2, 1906)
- WHY MARRY? Published as AND SO THEY WERE MARRIED. 1914. Revised as acting version of WHY MARRY? in Quinn's *Contemporary American Plays*. (Columbus, O., Nov. 1, 1917; Astor Theatre, Dec. 25, 1917)
- WHY NOT? Dram. of novelette by author, *Remating Time*. Boston, 1924. (Forty-eighth St. Theatre, Dec. 25, 1922)
- LOVELY LADY. (Belmont Theatre, Oct. 14, 1925)

WOOLF, BENJAMIN E.

- OFF TO THE WAR. Boston, 1861. (Boston, 1861)
- THE MIGHTY DOLLAR. (Park Theatre, Sept. 26, 1875)
- CLAIRE; OR, MATES AND CHECKMATES. Adap. of LE MAÎTRE DE FORGES, by Georges Ohnet. (Boston Museum, April 14, 1884)

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND PLAY LIST

YOUNG, WILLIAM

- PENDRAGON. MS. (Chicago, Dec. 5, 1881; Haverley's Fifth Ave. Theatre, Feb. 13, 1882)
- THE HOUSE OF MAUPRAT. With J. G. Wilson. [1882]
- THE RAJAH. 1882. (Madison Square Theatre, June 5, 1883)
- JOAN OF ARC. Adap. from JEANNE D'ARC. (Fifth Ave. Theatre, Dec. 8, 1890)
- GANELON. (Broadway Theatre, Jan. 5, 1891)
- IF I WERE YOU. (Hermann's Theatre, Dec. 19, 1892)
- YOUNG AMERICA. (Columbia Theatre, Boston, Aug. 25, 1894; Murray Hill Theatre, May, 1897)
- BEN HUR. Dram. of novel by Lew Wallace. Priv. printed, 1899. (Broadway Theatre, Nov. 29, 1899)
- THE SPRIGHTLY ROMANCE OF MARSAC. Dram. of novel by M. E. Seawell. (Republic Theatre, Dec. 3, 1900)
- A JAPANESE NIGHTINGALE. Dram. of novel by Onoto Wotanna. (Daly's Theatre, Nov. 23, 1903)

INDEX

INDEX

A

- Abbott, George. See List of Plays.
Abie's Irish Rose, II, 120-122; 319.
 About, Edmond, I, 24.
Adam and Eve, II, 317.
Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, II, 266.
 Adams, Maude, I, 133; 173; 203; 272; 281-282. II, 4.
Adding Machine, The, II, 110; 323.
 Ade, George, II, 4; 113-115. See also List of Plays.
Admiral, The, II, 308.
Adrea, I, 183-188. II, 4; 269; 312.
Adventures of François, The, II, 63; 318.
After Business Hours, I, 32. II, 282.
Aftermath, II, 324.
After the Wedding; or, A Grain of Sand, II, 283.
Afterthoughts, I, 243. II, 329.
Ah Sin, I, 110; 121. II, 299; 332.
L'Aieule, I, 283.
 Akins, Zoë, II, 80; 135; 141-144; 161. See also List of Plays.
Alabama, I, 243-245; 262. II, 329.
Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp, II, 266.
Albany Depot, The, I, 77. II, 305.
 Alberty, James, I, 49.
 Aldrich, Louis, I, 122.
 Aldrich, Thomas Bailey, 66; 141; 205-207. II, 81. See also List of Plays.
Alias Jimmy Valentine, II, 265.
Alice in Wonderland, II, 325.
 Alize, I, 24. II, 279.
Allatoona, I, 216-217. II, 309.
 Allen, Viola, I, 58; 209; 215; 271. II, 167.
All God's Chillun Got Wings, II, 162; 188; 206; 322.
All the Comforts of Home, I, 221. II, 294.
Alone, I, 240. II, 328.
Ambition, II, 274.
Ambush, II, 216-217; 323.
American, The, (by Daly), I, 22. II, 280.
American, The, (by James), II, 307.
Americana, II, 316.
American Born (by Belasco), I, 167. II, 237.
American Born (By George M. Cohan), II, 116; 118; 275.
American Citizen, An, II, 50.
American Claimant, The; or, *Mulberry Sellers Ten Years Later*, I, 115. II, 304; 332.
 American drama, condition of, after the Civil War, I, 3ff., at the beginning of the Twentieth Century. II, 2-7, during the second decade, 158-164; conferences on, 164; effect of Great War on, 207; comparison of, to European, 250-251.
 American Dramatists and Composers, Society of, I, 64.
 American Dramatists Club, I, 64.
American Duchess, An, I, 272. II, 289.
American Girl, An, II, 286.
American Idea, The, II, 275.
American Lord, An, II, 271.
Americans Abroad, I, 38. II, 288.
Americans in Paris, I, 39.
 Ames, Winthrop, II, 24-25.
 Amherst, College, I, 265. II, 213.
Among Thieves, I, 234. II, 295.
Anarchy, II, 312.
Ancient Mariner, The, II, 185; 322.
 Andersen, Hans, II, 94; 95.
 Anderson, Maxwell, II, 233-236. See List of Plays.
Angel in Hell, An, II, 266.
 Anglin, Margaret, II, 11; 25.
Anna Christie, II, 86; 165; 167; 173; 175-178; 199; 201; 321.
Ann Vroome, II, 237; 266.
 Anspacher, Louis K., II, 76.
Antick, The, II, 36.
Anti-Matrimony, II, 28; 34-35; 314.
 Apel, Paul, II, 222.
April Weather, I, 270. II, 289.
Arabian Night, An, or, *Haroun al Raschid and His Mother-in-Law*, I, 27. II, 280.
 Archer, William, I, 41; 67.
Are You Insured? I, 94. II, 298.
Argyle Case, The, II, 293; 320.
Aria da Capo, II, 148; 317.
Aristocracy, I, 60. II, 303.
Arizona, I, 248-250. II, 330.
Arkwright's Wife, II, 312.
 Arliss, George, I, 180. II, 64.
 Armstrong, Paul. See List of Plays.
Army with Banners, The, II, 308.
Arrant Knave, An, II, 313.

INDEX

Arrow Maker, The, II, 23; 265.
 Arthur, Joseph. *See* List of Plays.
 Arthur, Helen, II, 160.
 Arthur, Julia, I, 205.
Article 47, I, 24; 165. II, 279.
Artie, II, 263.
As A Man Thinks, I, 256-258; 263. II, 54; 330.
Assassin, The, II, 334.
At Bay, II, 331.
At Yale, II, 284.
Auctioneer, The, II, 309.
 Austin, Mary, II, 23.
Auful Truth, The, II, 84; 216; 324.

B

Bab, II, 154; 274.
Bachelor's Romance, A, II, 50.
Bachelor, The, I, 290. II, 292.
 Bacon, Frank, II, 119.
Bad Man, The, II, 111; 271.
Bad Samaritan, The, II, 263.
 Baker, B. A., I, 11.
 Baker, George Pierce, II, 3; 26; 47; 87; 167; 228; 241.
 Balzac, H., I, 290.
Banker's Daughter, The, I, 43-49; first form, 43; changes in, 44-49; 52; 79. II, 302.
Barbara Frietchie, I, 274. II, 290.
Barber of New Orleans, The, II, 152; 274.
Bard of Mary Redcliffe, The, I, 208. II, 311.
 Barnard, Charles, I, 162.
Baroness, The, II, 286.
Baron Rudolph, I, 49-50. II, 302.
 Barrett, Lawrence, I, 2; 69; 70; 72; 200; 201; 202; 203.
 Barrière, Théodore, I, 24; 272.
 Barrymore, Ethel, II, 142.
 Barrymore, Maurice, I, 169; 223; 243. II, 63.
 Barry, Philip, II, 81-84. *See also* List of Plays.
 Bateman, Kate, I, 9.
 Bates, Blanche, I, 179; 180; 191. II, 79.
Bath Comedy, The, I, 190-191.
Battle Cry, The, II, 331.
 Baus, Tamayo Y., I, 32; 70.
 Beach, Lewis, II, 161; 162; 236-237. *See also* List of Plays.
Beau Brummell, I, 266-269. II, 288.
Beauty and the Jacobin, II, 128; 327.
Be Calm, Camilla, II, 78; 310.
Because She Loved Him So, I, 228. II, 295.
Becky Sharp, II, 63; 318.
 Beecher, H. W., I, 19.
Before Breakfast, II, 170; 320.

Beggar on Horseback, II, 222-223; 224; 276; 307.
Beggars of Life, II, 236.
 Belasco, David, I, 3; 49; his association with Herne in California, I, 130-136; 156; 163-199; birth and education, 163-164; first appearance on stage, 163; first play, 164; influence of Boucicault on, 164; career on California stage, 164-167; early experiments in stage lighting, 165-166; stage manager at Madison Square Theatre, 167; at Lyceum Theatre, 169; collaboration with H. C. DeMille, 169-174; produces *Electra*, 171; collaborates with Franklyn Fyles, 174-176, with John Luther Long, 177-188; struggles with the Syndicate, 189; leases the Republic Theatre, 189; builds his own theatre, 193; its lighting, 193-194; his achievement, 197-199. II, 1; 4; 123; 129; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
Belle of New York, The, II, 111.
Belle Russe, La, I, 166-167. II, 267.
 Belot, Adolphe, I, 24; 202; 274. II, 335.
 Benrimo, J. H., II, 132. *See also* List of Plays.
 Bernard, Tristan, I, 290.
Bernice, II, 210-211; 296.
Bertha, the Sewing Machine Girl, I, 37.
Berühmte Frau, Die, I, 30.
Better Understanding, The, II, 74-75; 297; 328.
Betty's Finish, I, 269. II, 288.
Bewitched, II, 96-97; 228; 304; 325.
Beyond the Horizon, II, 171-173; 202; 203; 206; 321.
Bibliothekar, Der, I, 215-216.
Big Bonanza, The, I, 26; 119. II, 280.
Big Idea, The, II, 297; 328.
Big Rise, The, II, 328.
Bimbo the Pirate, II, 128; 327.
Bird in the Cage, The, I, 279. II, 290.
Bird of Paradise, The, II, 129-130; 332.
 Bird, R. M., I, 4; 39.
Birth, II, 209.
 Bisson, Alexandre, I, 25; 222; 228; 272.
Blackbeard, II, 243.
Blackmail, II, 285.
Black Sheep, A, II, 306.
 Blinn, Holbrook, II, 89.
 Bloodgood, Clara, I, 289.
 Bloomer, Roger, II, 238.
Blue and the Gray, The, I, 84. II, 297.
Blue Glass, II, 280.
Blue Grass Penelope, A, I, 112.
Blue Jeans, II, 265.
Blue Mouse, The, I, 290. II, 291.
 Blumenthal, Oscar, I, 32.

INDEX

Bocage, Henri, I, 25.
Bohemia, I, 272. II, 289.
 Boker, G. H., I, 5; 39. II, 229.
Bonheur Conjugal, I, 25.
Bonnie Briar Bush, The, II, 330.
Boomerang, The, II, 118; 325.
 Booth, Agnes, I, 50; 168.
 Booth, Edwin, I, 4; 9n.; 16; 203.
Boots and Saddles, II, 333.
Boss, The, II, 88-89; 230; 324.
 Boston University, I, 213.
 Boucicault, Dion, I, 1; 7; 11; 49; 85; 86; 109; 112; 124; 130; 164; 216; 217.
Bought and Paid For, II, 103; 271.
Bound East For Cardiff, II, 162; 167; 168-169; 320.
 Bourdet, Edouard, II, 252.
 Bradley, Alice, I, 196.
 Braham, "Dave," I, 95.
Brains, II, 292.
Brass Monkey, A, II, 306.
Breuster's Millions, II, 325.
Bride of the Whirlwind, The, II, 283.
Bride Roses, I, 78. II, 305.
Bridge Builder, The, II, 23.
Bridges, II, 311.
 Brighton, I, 41.
British Neutrality, I, 7. II, 286.
 Broadhurst, George, II, 4; 102-104. *See also* List of Plays.
Broadway, II, 90; 111-112; 230; 263; 287.
Broadway Jones, II, 116; 275.
 Broadway Theatre, Closing of, I, 4.
Broker of Bogota, The, I, 1; 4.
Bronze Statue, The, II, 286.
 Brown, Alice, II, 24. *See also* List of Plays.
 Browne, Porter E., II, 111. *See also* List of Plays.
 Browning, Robert, II, 151.
Brutus, I, 1; 4.
Buccaneer, The, II, 235; 265; 326.
 Buchanan, Thompson, II, 75-76. *See also* List of Plays.
Bull Run; or, The Sacking of Fairfax Courthouse, I, 5.
Bulls and Bears, I, 119. II, 272.
 Bulwer Lytton, Edward, I, 37.
Bunch of Keys, A, II, 306.
Bundle of Lies, A., II, 283.
Bunny, II, 326.
Buntling Ball, The, II, 288.
 Burgess, Neil, I, 162. *See also* List of Plays.
Burglar, The, I, 242; 243. II, 329.
 Burnett, Frances Hodgson, I, 208-209; 214-215; 241. II, 240. *See also* List of Plays.

Butcher's Revenge, The; or, The Seven Buckets of Blood, II, 266.
Butter and Egg Man, The, II, 223; 308.
Butterflies, The, I, 203. II, 274.
By Proxy, II, 309.
 Byrne, Dolly, II, 157.

C

Calhoun, A. R., I, 7.
Caliban, A Community Masque, II, 38-40; 48; 314.
 California, drama in, I, 7; 164-167. II, 46-47.
 California, University of, II, 129; 228; 237.
 Campbell, Bartley, I, 118-124; birth and training, 118; directs plays in Chicago, 118-119; career in California of, 119; attends rehearsals of *My Partner* in Berlin, 122; insanity and death of, 124; 165. II, 250. *See also* List of Plays.
Cameo Kirby, II, 127; 326.
Camilla's Husband, I, 131.
Canterbury Pilgrims, The, II, 5; 28-29; 38; 313.
Capitol, The, I, 104; 262. II, 329.
Caponsacchi, II, 151-152; 296.
Captain Courtesy, II, 274.
Captain Impudence, II, 324.
Captain Jinks of the Horse Marines, I, 277. II, 290.
Captain Lettarblair, II, 50.
Captain Molly, II, 300.
Capture of Fort Donelson, The, I, 5.
 Carb, David, II, 140.
 Carleton, Henry Guy, I, 203. *See also* List of Plays.
 Carnegie Institute of Technology, II, 164.
 Carolina Playmakers, II, 241.
 Carpenter, Edward Childs, II, 152-154. *See also* List of Plays.
 Carré, A., I, 272.
 Carter, Mrs. Leslie, I, 174; 176; 188-189.
Casanova, II, 303.
Case of Becky, The, I, 196.
Cave Girl, The, II, 317.
 Cayvan, Georgia, I, 169; 172n.
 Cazauran, A. R., I, 48-49.
Central Park; or, The House With Two Doors, I, 38. II, 333.
Cezalia, II, 306.
Challenge, The, II, 153; 274; 334.
Chameleon, The, II, 23; 323.
Champagne Charley, II, 330.
Champion, The, II, 328.
 Chanfrau, F. S., I, 105.
Changelings, The, II, 79-80; 287.
Charity Ball, The, I, 171-172. II, 268, 286.

INDEX

- Charles Lamb*, II, 271.
Charles O'Malley, I, 130. II, 300.
Charles II, I, 1.
Chastening, The, II, 308.
Chatterton, I, 208; 211. II, 311.
Chekhov, Anton, I, 150.
Cherry Pickers, The, II, 265.
Chicago, II, 111-112; 334.
Children of Earth, II, 21; 271.
Children of the Moon, II, 156; 292.
Chimmie Fadden, II, 329.
Chinese Love, II, 311.
Chorus Lady, The, II, 118; 293.
Chorus Rehearsal, The, II, 311.
Chris Christopherson, II, 173; 321.
Christmas Night, The; or, The Convict's Return, II, 267.
Chuck, II, 36.
Chums, I, 164. See also *Hearts of Oak*.
Churchill, Winston, I, 210.
Cinderella Man, The, II, 153; 274.
City, The, I, 291-293; II, 5; 292.
Civil War, the, effect on theatre, I, 3; plays dealing with, 5-8; 57-60; 150-156; 168; 176-177; 216-220; 223-228; 245; 258-261; 274.
Civilian Clothes, II, 76; 272.
Claim, The, II, 309.
Claire; or, Mates and Checkmates, II, 334.
Clarence, II, 127-128; 327.
Clarice, I, 229-234. II, 4; 295.
Clarke, J. I. C., I, 204.
Classmates, II, 286.
Cleo, II, 324.
Climbers, The, I, 275-276. II, 290.
Clio, I, 119. II, 273.
Clod, The, II, 236.
Close the Book, II, 296.
Club Baby, The, II, 310.
Coghlan, Rose, I, 131; 167.
Cohan, George M., II, 113; 115-118. See also List of Plays.
Colinette, I, 203. II, 274.
College Widow, The, II, 114; 263.
Collins, Wilkie, I, 19; 165; 167.
Colonel Carter of Cartersville, I, 245. II, 329.
Colonel George of Mount Vernon, I, 248; II, 330.
Colonel Tom, II, 313.
Colorado, I, 251. II, 330.
Color Guard, The, I, 7. II, 272.
Columbia University, II, 137.
Combustion, II, 329.
Comedian, The, I, 197. II, 270.
Come Here; or, The Debutante's Test, II, 279.
Come Out of the Kitchen, II, 74; 328.
Coming of Mrs. Patrick, The, II, 52; 276.
Community drama, the, II, 38-49; 241-245.
Commuters, The, II, 118; 293.
Comtesse de Somerive, La, I, 24.
Connelly, Marc, II, 220-225. See also List of Plays.
Connie Goes Home, II, 154; 274.
Conqueror, The, II, 324.
Conrad, R. T., I, 4.
Constitutional Point, A, I, 243; 253.
Contented Woman, A, II, 306.
Contrast, The, I, 52; 127. II, 113; 127.
Cook, George Cram, II, 162; 209.
Cooks, Too Many, II, 119.
Copperhead, The, I, 258; 263-264. II, 331.
Corcoran, Katharine. See Mrs. J. A. Herne.
Cordelia's Aspirations, I, 87; 91; 96. II, 298.
Coronet of a Duchess, The, I, 282-283. II, 290.
Corsican Lieutenant, The, II, 302.
Cottage in the Air, The, II, 133; 310.
Counterfeit Presentment, A, I, 69-70. II, 304.
Countess Gucki, The, I, 26; 31. II, 283.
Country Cousin, The, II, 60; 80; 127; 327.
County Chairman, The, II, 4; 114; 263.
County Fair, The, I, 162. II, 265; 272.
Coupon Bonds, I, 127.
Cousin Billy, I, 282, 283. II, 291.
Cowboy and the Lady, The, I, 273. II, 289.
Cox, W. N., II, 242.
Craig's Wife, II, 226-227; 308.
Crane, W. H., I, 55; 61; 64; 103; 245. II, 4; 115.
Craven, Frank, II, 103; 119-120. See also List of Plays.
Crawford, Francis Marion, I, 208-209. See also List of Plays.
Creole, The, I, 165. II, 266.
Crews, Laura Hope, II, 79; 136; 232.
Crisis, The, I, 210. II, 274.
Crosman, Henrietta, I, 190. II, 35; 132; 156.
Crothers, Rachel, II, 4; 5; 50-61; birth and training, 50-51; her protest against the standards of the world, 52-53; her recognition of woman's responsibility, 54-56; president Stage Women's War Relief, 56; her picture of social life since the Great War, 57-59; her satire on cult of self-expression, 59-60; her achievement, 60-61. See also List of Plays.
Crowns, I, 188-189. II, 312.
Cub, The, II, 271.
Cunningham, Leon, II, 237.

INDEX

Cupid at Vassar, II, 284.
Curse of Cain, The, II, 267.
 Curtis, G. W., I, 10.
Cuttyback's Thunder, II, 316.
Cyrano de Bergerac, II, 148; 301.

D

Daddy's Gone A-Hunting, II, 142; 264.
Daisy Mayme, II, 227; 308.
Daisy Miller, II, 307.
Dakolar, II, 312.
 Daly, Augustin, I, 1-38; birth, 7; comparison with Dunlap, 7; as dramatic critic, 9; classification of plays of, 13; forms association of managers, 16; opens Daly's Fifth Ave. Theatre, 16; opens New Fifth Ave. Theatre, 16; opens Daly's Theatre, 17; adaptations from French of, 20-26; theory of acting of, 23; adaptations from the German of, 26-32; adaptations from the Spanish of, 32-3; takes his company to London, 34; to Germany, 34; to Paris, 34; first performance of a Shakespearean comedy by an American company in Europe, 34; takes *The Taming of the Shrew* to Paris, 34; produces *As You Like It* in London, 35; nature of his adaptations of Shakespeare, 35; third visit to Paris of, 35; builds theatre in London, 35; adapts Tennyson's *The Foresters*, 35; his adaptation of *Twelfth Night*, 35, of *Much Ado About Nothing*, 35, of *The Merchant of Venice*, 35, of *The Tempest*, 35; last years and death, 36; his achievement, 36; inspiration to later playwrights, 37; 39; 40; 41; 71; 108; 109; 110; 119; 125; II, 1; 74; 108; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
 Daly, J. F., I, 7; 25; 30.
Dangerous Ruffian, A, I, 67.
Danites in the Sierras, The, I, 79; 116-117; 166. II, 317.
Dan's Tribulations, I, 91; 92. II, 298.
Darby and Lanty, I, 85. II, 297.
Dark City, The, I, 13; 17; 18. II, 280.
Darling of the Gods, The, I, 180-183. II, 269; 311.
 d'Aste, Ippolito, I, 68.
 Daudet, Alphonse, I, 274.
Daughters of Men, II, 5; 104; 309.
 Dauvray, Helen, I, 54; 55.
 Davenport, E. L., I, 118.
 Davenport, Fanny, I, 17; 24; 26.
David Harum, II, 4.
 Davis, Owen, II, 217-220. *See also* List of Plays.

Davis, R. H., I, 104; 253. *See also* List of Plays.
Davy Crockett, I, 105-108. II, 319.
Dawn of a To-Morrow, The, II, 272.
Day and a Night in New York, A, II, 306.
 Dazey, C. T., II, 101-102.
Death of Eve, The, II, 10-11; 319.
Deborah, I, 9.
Decision of the Court, The, I, 65. II, 316.
Déclassée, II, 142; 264.
 de Courcy, Charles, I, 25.
Deep Purple, The, II, 265.
Deep River, II, 235; 326.
Deep Tangled Wildwood, The, II, 222; 276; 307.
 de Koven, Reginald, II, 29; 43; 48.
De Lancey, II, 4; 330.
Delmonico's; or, Larks up the Hudson, I, 21; 25. II, 279.
 De Mille, Cecil, I, 194.
 De Mille, Henry C., I, 169-74. *See also* List of Plays.
 De Mille, William C., I, 198. *See also* List of Plays.
Denise, I, 23. II, 282.
Desire Under the Elms, II, 162; 188-190; 204; 206; 322.
Detour, The, II, 217-218; 284.
 De Walden, T. B., I, 7; 105. *See also* List of Plays.
Diamonds, I, 41. II, 302.
 Dickens, Charles, I, 130; 165; 172n.
 Dickinson, Anna. *See* List of Plays.
Dictator, The, I, 104. II, 285.
Diff'rent, II, 181; 202; 204; 321.
Digby's Secretary. *See* *The Private Secretary*.
Discovering America, II, 310.
Disreputable Mr. Reagan, The, I, 104. II, 284.
District Attorney, The, II, 309.
 Ditrichstein, Leo, I, 272.
Divorce, I, 13; 14. II, 279.
 Dodd, Lee W., II, 79-80. *See also* List of Plays.
Dog in the Manger, A, II, 306.
Dolce, I, 188. II, 312.
Dollar Mark, The, II, 271.
Dollars and Sense; or, The Heedless Ones, I, 31. II, 281.
Doll Master, The, II, 266.
Dominie's Daughter, The, II, 311.
Don Juan, I, 204. II, 315.
Don't Tell Her Husband, II, 329.
Down Broadway, I, 84.
 Doyle, A. Conan, I, 228.
Doyle Brothers, The, I, 84-85; 95. II, 297.
Dragon Fly, The, II, 274; 312.

INDEX

Drama League of America, The, II, 48; 164.
Drama Nuevo, Un, adaptation by Daly of, I, 32-33.
Drama Nuevo, Un, adaptation by Howells of, I, 70-72.
Drama of Civilization, The, II, 313.
 Dransfield, Jane, II, 150. *See also* List of Plays.
Dr. Claudius, II, 276.
Dream Maker, The, I, 235. II, 295.
Dreamy Kid, The, II, 171; 321.
 Drew, John, I, 26; 27; 203; 272. II, 4; 68.
Drifting Apart, I, 137-138. II, 300.
Drink, II, 267.
Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, I, 204. II, 326.
Drop of Poison, A, II, 283.
Drum-Taps, I, 57.
 Du Barry, I, 190; II, 269.
 Duffek, Nikolaus, I, 31.
Dulcy, II, 220; 276; 307.
 Dumas, Alexandre, fils, I, 23; 26; 204.
 Dumas, Alexandre, père, I, 22-23.
Dunce Boy, The, II, 247; 333.
 Dunlap, William, I, 7; 39.
 Dunning, Philip. *See* List of Plays.
 Dupree, Minnie, II, 58.
Dying Boy's Last Christmas, The, II, 266.

E

Eames, Clare, II, 232.
Earl, The, II, 288.
Earl of Pawtucket, The, I, 251. II, 330.
Easiest Way, The, II, 5; 106-108; 176; 333.
Easterner, The, II, 271.
Easy Come, Easy Go, II, 284.
 Eaton, Walter Prichard, II, 140.
L'Ecole des femmes, I, 51.
L'Ecole des maris, I, 51.
Editha's Burglar, I, 241-242.
Editor's Troubles, The, II, 297.
Education of Mr. Pipp, The, I, 253. II, 330.
Egypt, II, 90; 325.
 Egypt, American drama in, II, 92.
Ehre, Die, I, 32.
Electra, production by Belasco, I, 171.
Electricity, I, 234-235. II, 295.
Elevator, The, I, 75; 80. II, 304.
Embarrassment of Riches, The, II, 265.
Embassy Ball, The, I, 253. II, 330.
Embers, II, 317.
 Emerson, R. W., II, 201; 203; 205.
 Emery, Gilbert, II, 80; 212-216. *See also* List of Plays.
Emperor Jones, The, II, 162; 165; 178-181; 321.
Endless Chain, The, II, 79; 293.

Enemy, The, II, 323.
 Engel, Alexander, I, 290.
Engineer, The, I, 11-12.
 England, American drama in, I, 34-35; 67; 84; 117; 119; 122; 126; 167; 183; 215; 223; 229; 270; 276; 277; 289. II, 11; 19; 34; 92; 122; 125; 153; 247. *See also* List of Plays.
Enter Madame, II, 157; 333.
Episode, II, 80; 213; 287.
 Equity Players, II, 237.
Esmeralda, I, 214-215; 241. II, 240; 272; 294.
 Ethel, Agnes, I, 23.
L'Etrangère, I, 22.
Evening Dress, I, 78. II, 305.
Evergreen Tree, The, II, 40; 314.
Everyday, II, 58; 277.
Eviction, The, I, 166. II, 267.
Exorcism, II, 321.
Expressing Willie, II, 59-60; 277.
 Eyre, Laurence, II, 136. *See also* List of Plays.
 Eytinge, Rose, I, 11.

F

Fabre, Emile, I, 290.
Fair Co-Ed, The, II, 263.
Fairfax, I, 123. II, 273.
Fairyland, II, 147-148; 301.
Faith Healer, The, II, 5; 12; 14-17; 319.
False Friend, A, II, 288.
Famille Benoiton, La, I, 22.
Famille Pont-Biquet, La, I, 222.
Family Cupboard, The, II, 284.
Famous Mrs. Fair, The, II, 79; 293.
Fanciulla del West, La, I, 191-192.
Fantine, I, 40. II, 302.
Fashion, I, 1; 52; 166. II, 162.
Fast Family, The, I, 22n.
Fate, I, 118. II, 272.
Father and the Boys, II, 115; 263.
Faun, The, II, 133; 310.
 Faversham, William, II, 152.
 Fawcett, Edgar, I, 38. *See* List of Plays.
Feathertop, II, 33.
Female Bathers, The, I, 127.
Fenris the Wolf, II, 28; 29-30; 313.
 Ferber, Edna, II, 162; 224.
 Ferguson, Elsie, II, 143.
Fernande, I, 22n.
Feu Toupinel, I, 222.
Field God, The, II, 245; 297.
Fifty Miles From Boston, II, 275.
Finders—Keepers, II, 225.
Fine Feathers, II, 108; 334.
Fire Bringer, The, II, 10; 319.
First Families of the Sierras, The, I, 116.

INDEX

First Flight, II, 235; 264; 326.
First Gentleman of Europe, The, II, 272.
First Love, II, 144; 264.
First Man, The, II, 181-183; 203; 218; 321.
First Violin, The, I, 204. II, 315.
First Year, The, II, 119-120; 236; 276.
Fiske, Minnie Maddern, II, 63; 64; 67; 86; 87; 111; 136; 248.
Fitch, Clyde, I, 3; 66; 81; 265-296; birth and ancestry, I, 265; education, 265-6; beginning of career with *Beau Brummell*, 266-269; relations with Mansfield, 266-269; early adaptations from French and German, 272-273; historical plays, 273; begins best period, 275; his conception of melodrama, 284; his international reputation, 289; death of, 291; his last adaptations, 293; classification of the plays of, 293-295; his achievement, 294-296; II, 1; 4; 5; 62; 84; 250. See also List of Plays.
Fitzgerald, M. Eleanor, II, 163.
Five O'Clock, II, 265.
Five O'Clock Tea, I, 76; 80. II, 305.
Fixin's, II, 243.
Flame, The, II, 131; 332.
Flash of Lightning, A, I, 12; 13. II, 278.
Flattering Word, The, II, 225; 308.
Flavin, Martin, II, 156-157. See also List of Plays.
Flower of the Palace of Han, The, II, 308.
Fog, II, 168; 320.
Folline, I, 22; 272. II, 279.
Food, II, 286.
Fool, *The*, II, 323.
Fool from the Hills, The, II, 308.
Fool's Errand, A, I, 127. II, 312.
Fool There Was, A, II, 271.
Foot-Loose, II, 264.
Forbes, James, II, 78-79; 118. See also List of Plays.
For Congress, I, 104. II, 311.
Ford, Harriet, II, 109-110. See also List of Plays.
Foregone Conclusion, A, I, 74. II, 304.
Foresters, The, I, 35.
Forest Rose, The, I, 127.
Forget Me Not, I, 167.
For Money, I, 245. II, 329.
Forrest, Edwin, I, 4.
For the Defence, II, 323.
Fortune and Men's Eyes, II, 17; 323.
Fortune Hunter, The, II, 118; 325.
Forty-Five Minutes From Broadway, II, 116; 275.
Forty-nine, I, 117. II, 317.
Foster, Charles, I, 37.
Fountain, The, (by McLellan), II, 317.

Fountain, The, (by O'Neill), II, 186-187; 322.
Fourth Estate, The, II, 109; 323.
France, American drama in, I, 34; 223. II, 34; 92; 125; 165. See also List of Plays.
Francesca da Rimini, (by Boker), I, 1; 5; 200. II, 48; 229.
Francesca da Rimini, (by Crawford), I, 209-210. II, 276.
Frederick Lemaître, I, 266; 269-270. II, 288.
Frémont, Gen. J. C., I, 7.
French Doll, The, II, 328.
Friend and Foe, II, 273.
Friend Indeed, II, 297.
Friends, II, 123; 324.
Frisky Mrs. Johnson, The, I, 279. II, 290.
Frohman, Charles, I, 58.
Frohman, Daniel, I, 55; 168; 169; 170.
Frost, Robert, II, 48.
Frou-Frou, I, 23; 24. II, 279.
Fulda, Ludwig, I, 173; 272.
Fun In A Green Room, I, 52. II, 302.
Fyles, Franklin, I, 198. See also List of Plays.

G

Gale, Zona, II, 161; 208-209. See also List of Plays.
Galley Slave, The, I, 122; 249. II, 273.
Galloper, The, I, 104. II, 285.
Gamblers, The, II, 105; 309.
Ganelon, I, 202. II, 335.
Garcia, II, 278.
Garden of Paradise, The, II, 94-96; 98; 325.
Garland, Hamlin, I, 138; 140; 141; 158. II, 12.
Garland to Sylvia, A, II, 28; 313.
Garroters, The, I, 67; 75; 80. II, 304.
Gates, Eleanor, II, 144-145. See also List of Plays.
Gayler, Charles, I, 5; 37.
Genius, The, II, 286.
Genius and the Crowd, II, 316.
Gentle Grafters, II, 220; 284.
Gentleman of France, A, II, 293.
George, Grace, I, 289. II, 64; 136.
George Washington, Jr., II, 275.
Germanie, I, 24.
Germany, American drama in, I, 34; 41; 122; 183; 289. II, 34; 67; 122; 125. See also List of Plays.
Gerson, Virginia, I, 270.
Gerstenberg, Alice, II, 161.
Get Rich Quick Wallingford, II, 116; 275.
Getting a Polish, II, 127; 326.

INDEX

Gettysburg, II, 36.
 Gibson, C. D., I, 253.
Gibson Upright, The, II, 128; 327.
 Gilbert, Mrs. Anne H., I, 22; 283.
Gilded Age, The, I, 114; 213. II, 332.
Gilded Cage, The, II, 319.
Gilded Fool, A, I, 203. II, 274.
 Gillette, William, I, 3; 7; 57; 212-238;
 his idea of the relation between words
 and action, 212-213; birth and training,
 I, 213; first success as actor, 213; first
 play, 213; collaboration with Mrs.
 Burnett, 214; writes the first successful
 drama of the Civil War, 216; plays
 "Beene" in *Held by the Enemy*, 218;
 writes novel based on *A Legal Wreck*,
 220; his adaptations from French and
 German, 221-22; acts in *Too Much*
 Johnson, 222; in *Secret Service*, 223;
 in *Sherlock Holmes*, 228; in *Clarice*, 229;
 his one-act plays, 234; classification of
 his plays, 235; his dramatizations of
 fiction, 235; later adaptations of French
 and German plays, 235-236; plays of,
 in which he acted, 236; relation of the
 actor to the playwright, 236-238; his
 achievement, 237-238; 241; 290. II, 1;
 4; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
 Gillmore, Margalo, II, 174.
Girl and the Judge, The, I, 277. II, 290.
Girl I Left Behind Me, The, I, 174-176.
 II, 268; 293.
Girl of the Golden West, The, I, 191-192.
 II, 269.
Girls, I, 290. II, 291.
Girl Who Has Everything, The, II, 291.
Girl With the Green Eyes, The, I, 279-280.
 II, 290.
Gladiator, The, I, 1; 4. II, 48.
Glad of It, I, 281. II, 290.
Glance at New York, A, I, 4; 11; 84; 127.
 Glaspell, Susan, II, 160; 209-212. *See*
 also List of Plays.
 Glaucus, I, 200.
Goddess of Reason, The, II, 137; 307.
 Godferneaux, André, I, 290.
 Godfrey, Thomas, II, 48.
God Loves Us, II, 316.
Gold, II, 171; 175; 321.
Golden Widow, The, II, 282.
Goldfische, I, 29; 30.
Gold Mine, A, I, 64. II, 315.
Good Fellow, The, II, 224; 308.
Good Gracious Annabelle, II, 77; 310.
 Goodrich, Arthur, II, 151. *See also* List
 of Plays.
 Goodwin, N. C., I, 64; 103; 203; 273.
 II, 69.
Goose Hangs High, The, II, 237; 266.

Gossip, II, 239.
 Gottschalk, Ferdinand, I, 272; 276.
Governor of Kentucky, The, II, 293.
Governor's Lady, The, I, 196. II, 269.
Governor's Son, The, II, 116; 275.
 Gozzi, Carlo, II, 32.
Grand Army Man, A, I, 194. II, 269.
Grandmama, II, 283.
Granny, I, 282; 283. II, 290.
Grant's Campaign, I, 7.
Gran Uale, I, 119. II, 272.
Great Divide, The, I, 108. II, 4; 11-13;
 51; 195; 319.
Great God Brown, The, II, 190-194; 200;
 201; 203; 206; 322.
Greatness, II, 143; 264.
Great Unknown, The, I, 30. II, 282.
 Great War, effect on drama of, II, 207.
 Greek influence on American drama, II,
 189; 251; 252.
 Greeley, Horace, I, 117.
 Greene, Clay, I, 113; 150.
 Green, Elizabeth Lay, II, 242.
 Green, Erma, II, 243.
Green Eyed Monster, The, II, 283.
 Green, Paul, II, 162; 242-244. *See also*
 List of Plays.
Griffith Davenport. *See The Reverend*
 Griffith Davenport.
Griffith Gaunt; or, Jealousy, I, 10. II, 278.
Grip, The, II, 298.
 Groves, C., I, 167.
Guerillas, The, I, 6. II, 316.
Guy Domville, II, 307.
Gypsy Trail, The, II, 154; 302.

H

Hackett, J. H., I, 4.
 Hackett, James K., I, 210. II, 4.
 Haggard, Rider, I, 220.
Hairy Ape, The, II, 162; 183-184; 200;
 201; 202; 204; 206; 321.
Halbe Dichter, I, 31.
 Halévy, Ludovic, I, 23.
 Hale, Louise Closser, II, 59.
 Hamilton, Clayton, II, 74-75. *See also*
 List of Plays.
 Hampden, Walter, II, 148; 151; 152.
Handkerchief, The, II, 287.
Hanging of Nathan Hale, The, II, 266.
Happy Marriage, A, I, 290. II, 292.
 Harding, Ann, II, 216.
 Hare, John, I, 215.
 Harrigan, Edward, I, 66; 82-96; birth and
 ancestry, 82; training in California of,
 82; appearance with Hart in New York
 of, 82; becomes manager of Theatre
 Comique, 83; of New Theatre Comique,

INDEX

- 83; leases Park Theatre, 83; separates from Hart, 83; builds Harrigan's Theatre, 83; last appearance and death of, 83; development of his plays from vaudeville sketches, 83-85; his Irish characters, 86-96; contrast with Boucicault, 86; comparison with Hoyt, 103; 279. II, 1; 113; 136; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
- Harte, Bret, I, 14; 20; 38; 66; 108-114; collaboration with Mark Twain, 110-111; with T. E. Pemberton, 112; 120; 253; 274. II, 106; 108; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
- Hart, Tony, I, 82-83; 84.
- Harun al Raschid, I, 27.
- Harvard College, I, 213. II, 25-26; 33; 34; 87; 101; 133; 217; 228.
- Harvest, *The*, I, 270; 272. II, 289.
- Harvest Moon, *The*, I, 255-256. II, 5; 330.
- Hatteras Inlet; or, *Our Naval Victories*, I, 5.
- Haunted House, *The*, II, 266; 284.
- Hauptmann, G., II, 34; 251.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel, II, 33; 201; 203; 204; 205.
- Hawthornes, *The*. *See* *Shore Acres*.
- Hayes, Helen, II, 128; 154; 221.
- Hay, John, I, 42; 43; 72.
- Hazardous Ground, I, 21. II, 278.
- Hazel Kirke, I, 126; 127; 128. II, 312.
- Hazelton, George C., II, 131-132; 251. *See also* List of Plays.
- Head-Master, *The*, II, 310.
- Head of the Family, *The*, II, 289.
- He and She, II, 54-55; 60; 277.
- Heart of Maryland, *The*, I, 176-177. II, 268.
- Heart of Paddy Whack, *The*, II, 56; 277.
- Hearts, II, 273.
- Heartsease, II, 309.
- Hearts of Oak, I, 129; 133-136; 168. II, 267.
- Heir to the Hoorah, *The*, II, 265.
- He Knew He Was Right, I, 15-16.
- Held by the Enemy, I, 7; 57; 216-220. II, 294.
- Helena's Husband, II, 137; 318.
- Hell-Bent For Heaven, II, 248; 306.
- Henrietta, *The*, I, 55-57; revival of, 57. II, 302.
- Henry Esmond, I, 57.
- Herfords, *The*, II, 54.
- Her Great Match, I, 283; 285. II, 4; 291.
- Her Husband's Wife, I, 25. II, 74; 327.
- Her Lord and Master, I, 17.
- Herne, Chrystal, I, 157; 258. II, 59; 227.
- Herne, James A., I, 66; 125-162; birth, 129; early stage career of, 129-130; in California, 130 ff.; influence of Dickens on, 130; of Boucicault on, 130; association with Belasco, 130-136; sources of his early plays, 130-133; comes east with *Hearts of Oak*, 133-134; his theories about realism, 138-140; writes *Margaret Fleming* to prove them, 140; quotations from *Margaret Fleming*, 143, 145, 146; employs the "quiet ending" in *Shore Acres*, 149-150; produces *Griffith Davenport* and fails, 150-156; quotations from *Griffith Davenport*, 153-155; success with *Sag Harbor*, 157; death, 157; classification of plays of, 157-158; humanitarian interests of, 159; significance of *Margaret Fleming* and *Griffith Davenport*, 159-160; character drawing of, 160-161; 197; 198; 212. II, 1; 250. *See* List of Plays.
- Herne, Julie, I, 156; 157.
- Herne, Mrs. James A., I, 131; 133; 136; 137; 141; 146; 161.
- Heroine in Rags, *A*, I, 119. II, 273.
- Her Opinion of His Story, II, 305.
- Hero, *The*, II, 212-214; 287.
- Her Own Way, I, 280. II, 4; 290.
- Her Sister, I, 289-290. II, 291.
- Her Way Out, II, 324.
- Heywood, Thomas, as a character, I, 70.
- High Bid, *The*, II, 307.
- Highest Bidder, *The*, II, 268.
- High Road, *The*, II, 325.
- His Grace de Grammont, I, 270. II, 289.
- His Majesty, Bunker Bean, II, 79; 287.
- Hitchcock (Murdoch), Frank, I, 105-108.
- Hitchcock, Harry, I, 106.
- Hit the Trail Holiday, II, 117; 275.
- Hohe Lied, *Das*, II, 94.
- Hole in the Ground, *A*, II, 306.
- Holly Tree Inn, *The*, II, 329.
- Home Fires, II, 284.
- Home-Towners, *The*, II, 275.
- Honor, II, 283.
- Honor of the Family, *The*, I, 290. II, 291.
- Hooker, Brian, II, 145-148. *See also* List of Plays.
- Hoosier Doctor, *The*, II, 329.
- Horizon, I, 13; 14; 16; 18; 38; 108; 109; 125. II, 279.
- Horse Shoe Robinson, I, 4.
- Horst, Julius, I, 290.
- Hospitality, II, 237; 277.
- House of Mauprat, *The*, II, 335.
- House of Mirth, *The*, I, 286. II, 291.
- House That Jack Built, *The*, II, 271.
- Housum, Robert, II, 154. *See also* List of Plays.
- Howard, Bronson, I, 1; 3; 36; 38; 39-64; birth, 39; ancestry, 40; his first play,

INDEX

- 40; production of *Saratoga* by, 40; sees *Saratoga* in Germany, 41; his literary honesty, 42; his explanation of the laws of dramatic construction, 44-49; writes a new form of social comedy, 52-53; his achievement, 62-63; founds American Dramatists Club, 63; death, 64; 167; 169; II, 1; 62; 74; 100; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
- Howard, Sidney, II, 96; 227-233. *See also* List of Plays.
- Howells, William Dean, I, 66-81; inspires other playwrights, 66; London performances of his plays, 67; professional productions of, 68-74; his achievement, 79-81; collaborates with Mark Twain, I, 115; 125; 138; 140; 148; 158; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
- How to Avoid Drafting*, I, 6.
- How Women Love; or, The Heart of the Sierras*, I, 119. II, 273.
- Hoyt, Charles H., I, 96-103; birth and training, 96-97; analysis of his plays, 97 ff.; death, 102; his achievement, 102-103. II, 1; 113; 119; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
- Hughes, Hatcher, II, 248-249. *See also* List of Plays.
- Hungary, American drama in, I, 289.
- Hunter, Glenn, II, 128; 222.
- Hurlbert, W. H., I, 39.
- Hurricanes*, I, 50; 53. II, 302.
- Husband and Wife*, II, 309.
- Huston, Walter, II, 209.
- Hutton, Lawrence, I, 14.
- I**
- Iascaire*, I, 85. II, 297.
- Ibsen, H., I, 158. II, 34; 35; 217.
- Icebound*, II, 218-219; 284.
- Idol Breaker, The*, II, 308.
- Idyll of Red Gulch, The*, I, 110.
- If I Was Rich*, II, 316.
- If I Were You*, II, 335.
- Ihre Ideale*, I, 31.
- Ile*, II, 170; 321.
- Il Recrutio*, I, 6.
- Immigrants, The*, II, 314.
- Importance of Being a Woman, The*, II, 277.
- Importance of Being Clothed, The*, II, 277.
- Importance of Being Married, The*, II, 277.
- Importance of Being Nice, The*, II, 277.
- Impossible, The: A Mystery Play*, I, 79. II, 305.
- In Abraham's Bosom*, II, 162; 244; 297.
- In a Garden*, II, 82-83; 266.
- India, American drama in, II, 92; 165.
- Indian Giver, An*, I, 78. II, 305.
- Indian Summer*, I, 258. II, 331.
- In Dixon's Kitchen*, II, 243.
- Inheritors, The*, II, 162; 211; 296.
- In Mizzoura*, I, 245-246. II, 329.
- In 1999*, II, 286.
- In Old Kentucky*, II, 101-102; 112; 285.
- In Spite of All*, II, 312.
- International Match, An*, II, 282.
- In the Next Room*, II, 293; 324.
- In the North Woods*, I, 94. II, 299.
- In the Palace of the King*, I, 209. II, 276; 326.
- In the Vestibule Limited*, II, 315.
- In the Zone*, II, 169; 320.
- Intimate Strangers, The*, II, 128; 327.
- Investigation*, II, 298.
- Iron Will, An*, I, 126. II, 312.
- Italy, American drama in, I, 183; 289. *See also* List of Plays.
- I Wish I Was Rich*, II, 120.
- J**
- Jack Cade*, I, 1.
- Jalousie*, I, 228.
- James, Henry, I, 54; 125. *See* List of Plays.
- Janice Meredith*, II, 4.
- Japan, American drama in, I, 126. II, 165.
- Japanese Nightingale, A*, II, 335.
- Jeanne d'Arc* (by MacKaye), II, 4; 28; 30-31; 313.
- Jeff Briggs' Love Story*, I, 112.
- Jefferson, Joseph, I, 117.
- Jerome, Jerome K., I, 32.
- Jessop, G. H., I, 64.
- Jim Black; or, Regulator's Revenge, The*, I, 164. II, 266.
- Joan of Arc*, II, 335.
- John Delmer's Daughters*, I, 169. II, 286.
- Johnston, Mary, II, 137.
- Joint Owners in Spain*, II, 24.
- Jolly Roger, The*, II, 328.
- Jonathans Tochter*, II, 67.
- Jones, J. S., I, 4; 14; 39; 127.
- Jones, R. E., II, 39; 161.
- Joshua Whitcomb*, I, 128. II, 332.
- Juanita*, I, 192.
- Jucklins, The*, II, 329.
- Judgment of Bolinas Plain, The*, I, 112.
- Judith*, I, 13. II, 278.
- Judith and Holofernes*, I, 206-207.
- Judith of Bethulia*, II, 264.
- Judith Zaraine*, II, 317.
- Just A Wife*, II, 333.
- Just A Woman*, II, 334.
- Just Married*, II, 319.

INDEX

Just Out of College, II, 4; 114-115; 263.

Just Suppose, II, 74; 328.

K

Kadelburg, Gustav, I, 29; 30.

Kalich, Bertha, II, 63.

Kassa, I, 188. II, 312.

Kate, I, 61-62. II, 303.

Katy Did, II, 277.

Kaufman, George S., II, 220-225. *See also* List of Plays.

Keane, Doris, II, 92.

Kearney, Patrick, II, 238.

Kelcey, Herbert, I, 169.

Kelly, George, II, 225-227. *See also* List of Plays.

Kendal, Mrs. Margaret, I, 67, 67n; 76; 215; 270.

Kennedy, Charles Rann, II, 5; 155-156. *See also* List of Plays.

Kentuckian's Trip to New York, A, I, 4.

Kenyon, Charles, II, 24-25. *See also* List of Plays.

Kester, Paul, I, 210.

Kiki, I, 197. II, 270.

Kilpatrick, Gen. Judson, I, 216.

Kindling, II, 6; 308.

King Carrot, I, 21. II, 279.

Kingdon, Edith, I, 32.

King's Guardsman, The, II, 283.

King's Henchman, The, II, 148-150; 317.

Kismet, II, 129; 133-134; 310.

Kit Carson, II, 293.

Kit, the Arkansas Traveller, I, 105. II, 286.

Klein, Charles, II, 4; 104-105. *See also* List of Plays.

Klave and Queen, I, 57. II, 303.

Knife, The, II, 109; 334.

Knight, George S., I, 49.

Knoblock, Edward, II, 133-136. *See also* List of Plays.

Koch, F. H., II, 240-241.

Kreutzer Sonata, The, II, 63; 318.

Krieg im Frieden, I, 27; 28.

Kruger, Otto, II, 174.

Kummer, Clare, II, 76-78. *See also* List of Plays.

L

Labiche, Eugène, I, 283.

Lackaye, Wilton, I, 58.

Lacy, Ernest, I, 208. *See also* List of Plays.

Lady of Quality, A, II, 272.

Lady of the Rose, II, 156; 292.

Lady's Virtue, A, II, 60; 277.

Lady Windermere's Fan, I, 54.

Lamp and the Bell, The, II, 148; 317.

L'Arronge, Adolph, I, 31.

Last Chapter, The, II, 102; 271.

Last Night of Don Juan, The, II, 304.

Last of the Dandies, The, I, 277. II, 290.

Last of the Hogans, The, II, 299.

Last of the Lowries, The, II, 242.

Last Word, The, I, 30. II, 232.

Laugh, Clown, Laugh, I, 197. II, 270.

Launcelot and Elaine, II, 125-126; 324.

Launzi, II, 317.

Lavedan, Henri, I, 272.

La Verne, Lucille, II, 247.

Law of the Land, The, II, 104; 271.

Lazarus Laughed, II, 196-198; 201; 203; 206; 322.

Leaf From the Woods, A, II, 328.

Leah Kleschna, II, 4; 110-111; 317.

Leah the Forsaken, II, 278.

Lea, Marion, II, 63; 64.

Leather Patch, The, I, 93. II, 298.

Leclercq, Adolphe, I, 228.

Led Astray, I, 49.

Lee, Harry, II, 151.

Legal Wreck, A, I, 220-221. II, 294.

Legend of Norwood, A; or, *Village Life in New England*, I, 19. II, 278.

Lem Kettle, II, 274.

Lemons, I, 31. II, 280.

Leroux, Gaston, I, 194.

Les Misérables, I, 40.

Les Pattes de Mouche, I, 31; 54.

Letter of Introduction, A, I, 77; 80. II, 305.

Letzte Wort, Das, I, 30.

Levick, M., I, 7.

Lewisohn, Alice, II, 160.

Lewisohn, Irene, II, 160.

Liar, The, II, 289.

Life (by Buchanan), II, 271.

Life (adapted by Daly), II, 280.

Lighting, Stage, I, 165; 171; 192-193; 196.

Lightnin', I, 85; 119; 122. II, 265; 325.

Likely Story, A, I, 76; 80. II, 305.

Lillian's Last Love, I, 43. II, 302.

Lily, The, II, 269.

Limited Liability, A; or, *The Law of the Heart*, II, 283.

Lincoln, Abraham, I, 152; 153; 154; 259-260.

Lion and the Mouse, The, II, 4; 104; 309.

Lion's Mouth, The, II, 274.

Little Boy Blue, II, 327.

Little Brother to the Rich, A, II, 293; 323.

Little Johnny Jones, II, 275.

Little Journey, A, II, 56-57; 277.

Little Lord Fauntleroy, II, 208-209; 272.

Little Millionaire, The, II, 275.

INDEX

- Little Miss Million*, I, 32. II, 282.
Little Poor Man, The, II, 151; 311.
Little Princess, The, II, 272.
Little Shepherd of Kingdom Come, The, II, 334.
Little Silver Ring, The, II, 310.
Little Supper, The, II, 318.
“Little Theatres,” I, 240. II, 150; 163; 225.
Living for Show, II, 283.
Lloyd, D. D., I, 104. *See also* List of Plays.
Logan, (Sykes) Olive, I, 38. *See also* List of Plays.
London by Gaslight, I, 12.
Lonely Heart, The, II, 96; 325.
Lone Pine, The, II, 267.
Lonesome Road, II, 244; 297.
Long, John Luther, I, 3; 177–189; collaboration with Belasco, 177–188; other plays of, 188–189; 198; 199. II, 4; 123; 136; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
Long Voyage Home, The, II, 169; 320.
Lord Chumley, I, 171. II, 268; 286.
Lord's Will and Other Carolina Plays, The, II, 243, 297.
Lorgaire, *The*, I, 86. II, 297.
Lortie's Wedding, II, 278.
Lost, II, 328.
Lost Paradise, The, I, 173. II, 286.
Lost Pleiad, The, II, 150; 287.
Lost River, The, II, 265.
Lottery of Love, The, I, 25. II, 282.
Love in a Mask, Our Pretty Grandmothers; or, Seventy Years Ago, II, 283.
Love-In-a-Mist, II, 80; 287.
Love in Harness, I, 25. II, 282.
Love in Tandem, I, 25. II, 74; 282.
Lovely Lady, II, 73; 334.
Love on Crutches, I, 31; 32; 34. II, 281.
Lovers' Lane, I, 277. II, 290.
Love's Young Dream, I, 25. II, 280.
Luck of Roaring Camp, The, I, 112.
Lucky Sam McCarver, II, 229–230; 304.
Lullaby, The, II, 135; 310.
Lulu Belle, II, 97; 325.
Lys, Le, I, 194.

M

- Macgowan, Kenneth, II, 162.
MacKaye, James Steele, I, 3; 16; 126–127; 167. II, 27. *See also* List of Plays.
MacKaye, Percy, II, 4; 11; 25; 27–45; ancestry in the theatre, II, 27; education, 27; begins professional work for the theatre with his father, 27; plays in regular form, 28–38; masques, 38–42; operas, 42–43; critical works of, 43; his achievement as an inspirational force, 43–44; 48; 160; 249. *See also* List of Plays.
Madama Butterfly, I, 179.
Madame Butterfly, I, 177–179. II, 123; 130; 268; 311.
Madame Sand, II, 137–139; 318.
Madeleine and the Movies, II, 117; 275.
Madeleine Morel, I, 10. II, 108; 279.
Maggie Pepper, II, 105; 309.
Magical City, The, II, 141–142; 264.
Magnolia, II, 328.
Maid and the Moonshiner, The, II, 306.
Main Line, The; or, Rawson's Y, I, 169. II, 286.
Maison Neuve, La, I, 21; 272.
Major André, I, 280–281. II, 290.
Major Pendennis, II, 68; 318.
Major, The, I, 93. II, 298.
Man and Wife, I, 19–20. II, 279.
Man From Home, The, II, 5; 80; 126–127; 326.
Mannerling, Mary, II, 4.
Man of the Hour, The, II, 4; 102–103; 271.
Man of the World, A, I, 242. II, 328.
Mansfield, Richard, I, 200; 203; 204; 205; 266. II, 4; 18; 126. *See also* List of Plays.
Man's Man, A, II, 238, 308.
Man's Name, The, II, 334.
Man's World, A, II, 5; 52–54; 60; 277.
Man Upstairs, The, II, 329.
Marco Millions, II, 194–196; 203; 322.
Margaret Fleming, analysis of and quotations from, I, 140–146; 158. II, 300.
Margery's Lovers, II, 315.
Marie Odile, II, 135; 310.
Mariner's Compass, The, I, 133, 134–136.
Marlowe, II, 323.
Marlowe, Julia, I, 203; 206; 207; 242; 274. II, 17–18; 30; 31; 137.
Marquise, La, I, 21.
Marriage, II, 312.
Marriage, 1892, I, 270.
Marriage by Moonlight, I, 131–133. II, 267; 300.
Marriage Game, The, II, 290.
Marryatt, Florence, I, 17.
Marrying Mary, II, 324.
Mars, Antony, I, 25.
Marse Covington, II, 115; 263.
Marshall, Frank, I, 41.
Marty Malone, II, 299.
Mary, the Fishermen's Child, I, 137–138.
Mary the Third, II, 58; 277.
Masked Ball, The, I, 272. II, 288.
Masks, II, 317.
Mason, John, I, 258. II, 64.
Masque of American Drama, II, 48–49; 332.

INDEX

- Masque of Judgment, The*, II, 7-10; 319.
Masque of Labor, A, II, 314.
Masterpiece of Diplomacy, A, I, 78. II, 305.
Mater, II, 5; 28; 34; 44; 313.
Matinee Hero, The, II, 328.
Matinee Idol, The, II, 330.
Matrimony, II, 273.
 Matthews, Brander, I, 14; 43; 57; 61; 64-65. See also List of Plays.
 Matthison, Edith Wynne, II, 11; 23; 79.
May Blossom, I, 156; 168. II, 268.
 Mayo, Frank, I, 106; 108; 115.
Mayor and the Manicure, The, II, 115; 263.
McAllister's Legacy, II, 298.
 McCabe, J. D., Jr., I, 6.
 McEvoy, J. P., II, 120.
 McGroarty, J. S., II, 45-46.
 McGuire, William Anthony, II, 111; 120. See also List of Plays.
 McIntyre, John T., II, 145. See also List of Plays.
 McLellan, C. M. S., II, 4; 110-111. See also List of Plays.
McNooney's Visit, II, 298.
McSorley's Inflation, II, 298.
Meddler, The, II, 329.
 Meilhac, Henri, I, 23.
Mélodrame, II, 111.
Member from Ozark, The, II, 330.
Memnon, I, 203. II, 274.
Men and Women, I, 172-173. II, 268; 286.
Mercedes, I, 205-206; 211. II, 264.
Mere Man, II, 331.
 Merington, Marguerite, II, 50.
 Merivale, H. C., I, 167.
Merry Wives of Gotham, The, II, 136; 288.
Merton of the Movies, II, 222; 276; 307.
Metamora, I, 4.
Met by Chance, I, 55. II, 302.
Michel Auclair, II, 304.
 Michel, Georges, I, 283.
 Middleton, George. See List of Plays.
Midnight Bell, A, II, 306.
Mighty Dollar, The, I, 6. II, 334.
 Miles, G. H., I, 5.
Miles Standish, I, 73.
Milestones, II, 134; 310.
Milk While Flag, A, II, 306.
 Millay, Edna St. Vincent, II, 148-150; 162. See also List of Plays.
 Miller, Henry, I, 58; 169. II, 11; 14; 25; 79.
 Miller, Joaquin, I, 116-118. See also List of Plays.
Millionaire's Daughter, The, II, 267.
Mills of the Gods, The, II, 271.
Minick, II, 224; 307.
Minute Men of 1774-75, The, I, 136-137. II, 300.
Miracle Man, The, II, 117; 275.
Miss Civilization, II, 285.
Miss Helyett, I, 174. II, 268.
Mission Play, The, II, 3; 6; 45-46.
Miss Lulu Bett, II, 208-209; 293.
Miss Nelly of N'Orleans, II, 136; 288.
Mistress Betty, I, 271. II, 289.
Mistress Nell, II, 132; 300.
 Mitchell, Langdon, I, 3. II, 4; 63-68; 73. See also List of Plays.
 Mitchell, S. Weir, II, 63.
M'iss, I, 113.
Model, The, II, 330.
Modern Match, A, I, 270. II, 288.
 Modjeska, Helena, I, 271.
 Moeller, Philip, II, 137-140; 161; 251. See also List of Plays.
 Molière, I, 51-52; 204.
Molière, II, 139-140; 318.
Moll Pitcher, I, 4.
Mona, II, 145-147; 301.
Monaldi, II, 312.
Money from Home, II, 120.
Money Mad, II, 313.
Money Makers, The, II, 309.
Monsieur, I, 203-204. II, 315.
Monsieur Alphonse, I, 22. II, 279.
Monsieur Beaucaire, II, 4; 126; 326.
 Moody, William Vaughn, II, 1-17; birth and ancestry, 7; education, 7; his verse dramas, 7-11; the dignity of humanity in, 9; his prose plays, 11-16; death of, 14; 25; 27; 51; 72; 200; 251. See also List of Plays.
Moon of the Caribbees, The, II, 169; 184; 321.
Moorcroft, I, 38; 41; 42-43. II, 302.
 Moore, J. O., I, 216.
Morals, II, 304.
Mordecai Lyons, II, 298.
 Morgan, Agnes, II, 160.
 Morris, Clara, I, 10.
 Morton, Martha, II, 50.
Morven and the Grail, II, 301.
 Mosenthal, S. H. von, I, 9; 10; 26.
Moth and the Flame, The, I, 272. II, 289.
Mother and the Father, The, I, 78. II, 305.
Mother Carey's Chickens, II, 277.
 Mountaineers, Plays of the, I, 214. II, 36; 78; 102; 109; 240-243; 245-249.
Mountain Man, The, II, 78; 311.
Mouse Trap, The, I, 67; 76; 80. II, 305.
 Mowatt, Anna C. O., II, 162.
Mr. Antonio, II, 127; 327.
Mr. Lazarus, II, 293; 320.
Mr. Pitt, II, 209; 293.
Mrs. Grundy, Jr., II, 289.

INDEX

- Mrs. Leffingwell's Boots*, I, 252. II, 330.
Mrs. Molly, II, 277.
Mr. Thompson's Prodigal, I, 109.
Mr. Wilkinson's Widows, I, 222. II, 294.
Muddy Day, *The*, I, 93-94. II, 298.
Mulligan Guard, *The*, I, 87; 88; 96.
Mulligan Guard Ball, *The*, I, 83; 88-89. II, 297.
Mulligan Guard Chowder, *The*, I, 89. II, 298.
Mulligan Guard Nominee, *The*, I, 90. II, 298.
Mulligan Guard Picnic, *The*, I, 88. II, 297.
Mulligan Guard Surprise, *The*, I, 89; 91. II, 298.
Mulligan Guards and the Skidmores, *The*, I, 88.
Mulligan Guards' Christmas, *The*, I, 89; 91. II, 298.
Mulligans' Silver Wedding, *The*, I, 90. II, 298.
Mulligan Surprise Party, *The*, II, 298.
Murdoch, Frank Hitchcock, I, 105-108.
See also List of Plays.
Murdoch, James E., I, 105; 240.
Murger, Henri, I, 272.
Music Box, *The*, II, 329.
Music Master, *The*, II, 104; 309.
My Colleen, I, 150. II, 300.
My Foolish Wife, I, 119.
My Geraldine, II, 273.
My Lady's Dress, II, 134; 310.
My Maryland, I, 274.
My Partner, I, 119-122. II, 273.
Myself Bettina, II, 52; 277.
Mysterious Inn, *The*, II, 266.
My Wife's Husbands, II, 324.
- N
- Nancy and Company*, I, 31; 34. II, 282.
Nancy Lee, II, 334.
Napoleon Bonaparte, I, 204. II, 326.
Napoleon Crossing the Rockies, II, 29; 315.
Nathan Hale, I, 273. II, 289.
National Guard, *The*, I, 5.
Naughty Anthony, I, 177. II, 268.
Necessary Evil, *The*, II, 308.
Ned McCobb's Daughter, II, 230-232; 304.
Needles and Pins, I, 31. II, 281.
Neighborhood Playhouse, *The*, II, 39; 160.
Neighbor Jackwood, I, 127.
Nemesis, I, 261. II, 331.
Nero, II, 326.
Nervous Wreck, *The*, II, 220; 234.
Nettie, II, 115; 263.
New Blood, I, 246. II, 5; 329.
New Brooms, II, 120; 276.
New Citizenship, *A Civic Ritual*, *The*, II, 314.
New King Arthur, *The*, II, 288.
New Magdalen, *The*, I, 167.
New Marriage, *The*, II, 67; 318.
Newport, I, 38. II, 311.
New South, *The*, I, 150.
New Theatre, *The* (Chicago), II, 3.
New Theatre, *The* (New York), II, 3; 23; 24; 25; 87; 133.
New Theatre Comique, *The*, I, 83.
New Year's Call, *A*, II, 328.
New York and Brooklyn; or, The Poor Sewing Girl, I, 37.
New York Burglars; or, Wedded by Moonlight, I, 37.
New York Fireman, *The*, I, 4.
New York Idea, *The*, II, 4; 63-67; 318.
New York in 1860; or, a Hit at the Times, I, 37.
Next of Kin, *The*, II, 105; 309.
Nice People, II, 57-58; 60; 277.
Nichols, Anne, II, 121-122. *See also* List of Plays.
Nick of the Woods, I, 4; 105.
Nigger, *The*, II, 3; 5; 87-88; 324.
Night Before Christmas, *The*, II, 305.
Nightingale, *The*, II, 331.
Night Off, *A; or, A Page From Balzac*, I, 29; 34. II, 281.
Night's Frolic, *A*, II, 329.
Ninety Days, II, 294.
Noah, M. M., I, 4.
Noble Rogue, *A*, II, 313.
No 'Count Boy, *The*, II, 243.
No Name, I, 20. II, 279.
North Carolina, University of, II, 241; 243.
North Dakota, University of, II, 233; 240.
Norwood, I, 7.
Nos Bons Villageois, I, 21; 122.
Not Guilty, II, 267.
Notoriety, II, 299.
Not So Long Ago, II, 136; 216; 323.
Nowadays, II, 317.
Nydia, I, 200.
- O
- Octoroon*, *The*, I, 4. II, 153.
Odette, I, 21. II, 281.
L'Officier de Fortune, I, 24.
Off Nag's Head, II, 242.
Off to the War, I, 6. II, 334.
O'Higgins, Harvey, II, 110. *See also* List of Plays.
Ohio Lady, *The*, II, 327.
Ohnet, Georges, I, 24.
Old Fashioned Marriage, *An*, II, 283.

INDEX

Old Homestead, The, I, 128-129; 161. II, 332.
Old Lady, 31, II, 56; 277.
Old Lavender, I, 79; 85. II, 297.
Old Lavender Water; or, Round the Docks, I, 85.
Old Love and the New, The, I, 49.
Old Love Letters, I, 50-51. II, 302.
Old Man of Edenton, The, II, 243.
Old Sweetheart of Mine, An, II, 284.
Oliver Goldsmith, I, 250-251. II, 330.
Oliver Twist, I, 130. II, 300.
Olivia, II, 267.
Omar the Tentmaker, II, 131; 332.
Once Upon a Time, II, 56; 277.
One, II, 310.
O'Neill, Ella Quinlan, II, 166.
O'Neill, Eugene, II, 91; 136; 160; acts in *Thirst*, 162; 165-206; international quality in the work of, 165; birth and education, 166; adventures of, on sea, 166-167; in South America, 166-167; joins father's company, 167; newspaper experience of, 167; first plays of, 167; attends Harvard College, 167; becomes associated with Provincetown Players, 167; productions of one-act plays of, 167-171; wins Pulitzer Prize with *Beyond the Horizon*, 173; his own experiences reflected in plays, 173-175; re-writes *Chris* as *Anna Christie*, 175; explanations of his plays by, 177, 192-193, of his philosophy of composition by, 199; symbolism of, 178, 183, 186, 188, 190-199, 202; satire of modern business by, 195; progressive quality of art of, 200; mysticism of, 201, 202; Hawthorne and, 203-204; personality of, 204-205; Emerson and, 205; the poet in, 206; 219; 252. *See also* List of Plays.
O'Neill, James, I, 131; 166.
O'Neill, Nance, I, 207.
One of Our Girls, I, 1; 54-55. II, 118; 302.
1+1=3; or, The Sins of the Fathers, II, 324.
Only a Jew, II, 319.
Only a Tramp, I, 49-50. II, 302.
Only Son, The, II, 325.
Only Thirty-Eight, II, 74; 328.
On Probation, I, 64. II, 315.
On The Quiet, I, 251. II, 330.
On The Rhine, I, 119. II, 273.
On Trial, II, 110; 323.
O'Reagans, The, I, 94. II, 298.
Oregon Idyll, An, I, 118. II, 317.
Other Girl, The, I, 252. II, 4; 330.
Other Rose, The, II, 317.
Other Woman, The, I, 104. II, 285.
Our Best Society, I, 38.

Our Children, II, 265.
Our City, II, 279.
Our English Friend, I, 28, 29. II, 281.
Our First Families, II, 288.
Our Flag is Nailed to the Mast, I, 5.
Our Mysterious Boarding House, II, 266.
Our New Minister, II, 332.
Ourselves, II, 55-56; 277.
Our Union Saved, I, 5.
Out of the Question, I, 68-69. II, 304.
Out of the Streets, I, 37.
Outside, The, II, 296.
Outside Man, The, II, 329.
Outside Looking In, II, 264.
Owens, John E., I, 4; 215.

P

Paganini, II, 310.
Pageant of the North West, The, II, 241.
Paid in Full, II, 5; 105-106; 333.
Painful Predicament of Sherlock Holmes, The, I, 234; II, 295.
Palmer, A. M., I, 14; 16; 44.
Palmer, Rose A., II, 151.
Palmy Days, II, 331.
Pals First, II, 79; 287.
Pamela's Prodigy, I, 270. II, 288.
Papa, II, 142; 264.
Papillon, Le, I, 21.
Paquita, I, 124. II, 273.
Pardon My Glove, II, 264.
Parker, L. B., I, 162.
Parlor Car, The, I, 68; 80. II, 304.
Parlor Match, A, II, 306.
Parsloe, C. T., I, 110.
Parting Friends, I, 78. II, 305.
Passing Regiment, The, I, 27; 28. II, 281.
Patterson, J. Medill, II, 109-110. *See also* List of Plays.
Paul Aruff; or, The Love of a Serf, I, 166. II, 267.
Paul Jones, I, 4.
Paul Kauvar, I, 126-127. II, 313.
Paul Revere, I, 4.
Pawn Ticket No. 210, II, 268.
Payne, J. H., I, 4; 39.
Peabody, Josephine Preston, II, 5; 17-23; wins Stratford Prize, 19; 25; 48. *See also* List of Plays.
Peace Manoeuvres, II, 285.
Peggy, II, 277.
Peggy from Paris, II, 263.
Pendennis, II, 68. *See also* *Major Pendennis*.
Pendragon, I, 201. II, 335.
Pennsylvania, University of, II, 48; 49.
People's Lawyer, The, I, 130.
People, The, II, 296.

INDEX

- Peril; or, Love at Long Branch*, I, 118. II, 272.
Perle noire, La, I, 12; 13.
Persecuted Traveller, The, II, 266.
Persian Poppy, The, II, 287.
Pete, I, 94. II, 298.
Peter Stuyvesant, I, 61. II, 303; 316.
Petrie, W., I, 37.
"Phelps, Meridan." See Mansfield, R.
Phelps, Pauline, I, 194.
Picard, André, I, 197.
Pickwick Papers, II, 278.
Pilgrimage Play, The, II, 46-47; 326.
Pilgrim Spirit, The, II, 47-48; 265.
Pinero, A. W., I, 10.
Pinwheel, II, 238.
Piper, The, II, 5; 18-22; 323.
Pipes of Pan, The, II, 153-154; 274.
Pique, I, 13; 16; 18. II, 280.
Plain Woman, A, II, 109.
Plantation Thomassin, La, I, 222.
"Plays and Players," II, 163.
Poe, Edgar Allan, I, 228; 229.
Pokey; or, The Beautiful Legend of the Amorous Indian, II, 318.
Poldarkin, II, 327.
Politician, The, I, 104.
Pollock, Channing, See List of Plays.
Polly With a Past, II, 317.
Polygamy, II, 110; 293; 320.
Pomeroy's Past, II, 78; 311.
Poole, J. F., I, 7.
Poor Little Rich Girl, The, II, 144; 294.
Poor of New York, The, I, 4.
Popularity, II, 275.
Porter's Troubles, The, II, 297.
Portrait of Mrs. W., The, II, 23; 323.
Possession, II, 317.
Potash and Perlmutter, II, 122; 309.
Pot Luck, II, 154; 274.
Potter, P. M., I, 210; 290.
Potters, The, II, 120; 316.
Poverello, Il, II, 151.
Pretty Sister of José, The, II, 272.
Prevois, Baroness de, I, 24.
Previous Engagement, A, I, 78; 305.
Price, The, II, 103-104; 271.
Prince and the Pauper, The, I, 115.
Prince of Parthia, The, II, 48.
Princess Marries the Page, The, II, 317.
Princess Priscilla's Fortnight, The, II, 133.
Princess Royal, The, I, 24. II, 280.
Princess Zim-Zim, II, 89-90; 325.
Prince There Was, A, II, 275.
Princeton University, II, 68; 166.
Private Secretary, The, I, 215-216; 294.
Processional, II, 238.
Prodigal's Return, The, I, 165. II, 266.
Professor, The, I, 214. II, 294.
Proper Impropriety, A, II, 329.
Proud Woman, A, II, 324.
Provincetown Players, The, II, 161-163; 167; 168; 169; 175; 209; 211.
Puccini, Giacomo, I, 179; 191.
Pudd'nhead Wilson, I, 115. II, 316.
Pulitzer Prize, The, II, 69; 208; 219; 227; 229; 244; 248.
Putnam, I, 4.
- Q
- Queed*, II, 287.
Queen and Woman, II, 312.
Queen Victoria, II, 141; 273; 287.
- R
- Rabouilleuse, La*, I, 290.
Rag Baby, A, II, 306.
Ragged Earl, The, II, 311.
Railroad of Love, The, I, 29; 30. II, 282.
Rainbow, The, II, 74; 328.
Rajah, The, I, 202. II, 335.
Ranger, The, II, 330.
Rankin, McKee, I, 116; 117.
Rankin, Mrs. McKee, I, 116; 117.
Ranson's Folly, II, 285.
Raub der Sabinerrinnen, Der, I, 29.
Raymond, John T., I, 5; 64; 114; 119.
Reade, Charles, I, 10.
Rebellion, II, 109-110; 323.
Recklessness, II, 168; 320.
Reckless Temple, I, 243. II, 329.
Rector, The, II, 51; 276.
Red Letter Nights, II, 281.
Red Owl, The, I, 234. II, 295.
Red Scarf, The, I, 13; 14. II, 278.
Register, The, I, 80. II, 304.
Rehan, Ada, I, 27; 29; 30; 35.
Reif von Reiflingen, I, 28.
Reilly and the Four Hundred, I, 94. II, 299.
Remating Time, II, 72.
Rescuing Angel, The, II, 310.
Returned Volunteer, The, I, 7.
Return of Eve, The, II, 79; 287.
Return of Peter Grimm, The, I, 194-196. II, 156; 269.
Reverend Griffith Davenport, The, I, 150-156; source of, 150; analysis of and quotations from, 151-155; fate of manuscript of, 156n. II, 301.
Revolution, The, plays dealing with, I, 136-137; 273; 280-281.
Reynolds, W. C., I, 6.
Rhodes, Harrison, II, 132-133.
Rib of the Man, The, II, 308.
Rice, Elmer, II, 110; 248. See also List of Plays.

INDEX

Richard Carrel, I, 210. II, 4.
Richardson, A. S., I, 115.
Richepin, Jean, I, 190.
Richman, Arthur, II, 84; 136; 216-217.
See also List of Plays.
Rich Man's Son, A, II, 293.
Rienzi, II, 312.
Rinaldo, the Doctor of Florence, I, 208.
 II, 311.
Ring and the Book, The, II, 151.
Ring of Truth, The, II, 151.
Rio Grande, I, 258. II, 331.
Rip van Winkle (by Boucicault and Jefferson), I, 5; 85.
Rip van Winkle (by Herne), I, 130.
Rip van Winkle (by MacKaye), II, 42; 43; 48; 314.
Rise of Silas Lapham, The, II, 324.
Risks; or, Insure Your Life, I, 118. II, 272.
Rives, Amélie, II, 80.
Roadhouse in Arden, The, II, 318.
Road Together, The, II, 317.
Robber, The, II, 295.
Robbery, The, II, 311.
Robert Elsmere, I, 221. II, 294.
Robeson, Paul, II, 181; 188.
Robson, Eleanor, I, 113. *See also* List of Plays.
Robson, Stuart, I, 55; 110; 250.
Robin Hood; or, The Merry Outlaws of Sherwood Forest, II, 234.
Robinson, E. A., II, 25; 48.
Roi Carotte, Le, I, 21.
Roll Call, The, A Masque of the Red Cross, II, 314.
Roll of the Drum, The, II, 266.
Rollo's Wild Oat, II, 78; 310.
Romance, II, 92-94; 325.
Romance of a Poor Young Man, The, II, 333.
Rome Vaincue, I, 24.
Room Forty-Five, I, 78. II, 305.
Rope, The, II, 170; 321.
Rose Briar, II, 128; 327.
Rosedale; or, The Rifle Ball, I, 37. II, 333.
Rose, E. E., I, 210.
Rose Michel (by Daly), II, 283.
Rose Michel (by Steele MacKaye), I, 2. II, 312.
Rose of the Rancho, The, I, 192-193. II, 4; 129; 269; 332.
Rosenfeld, Sidney, I, 103.
Rosen, Julius, I, 26; 31.
Roughing It, I, 13; 20. II, 279.
Round the Clock, II, 279.
Royal Fandango, A, II, 144; 264.
Royal Middy, The, II, 280.
Royal Mounted, The, II, 286.
Royal Rogue, A, II, 309.

Royal Youth, The, I, 23. II, 281.
Royle, Edwin Milton, II, 4; 123-126.
See also List of Plays.
Ruini, II, 249; 306.
Runaway Colt, A, II, 306.
Running for Office, II, 275.
Russell, Annie, I, 215; 277.
Russia, American drama in, I, 289. *See also* List of Plays.
Ryley, Madeleine Lucette, II, 50.

S

Sag Harbor, I, 156-158. II, 301.
Saint Gaudens Masque-Prologue, II, 38; 313.
Saint Louis, A Civic Masque, II, 38; 40; 314.
Salomy Jane, I, 113. II, 265.
Salutation, The, II, 308.
Salvation Nell, II, 5; 86-87; 324.
Salvini, Alexandre, I, 68; 74.
Sam, II, 286.
Sam Average, II, 36.
Samson (by Gillette), I, 234. II, 295.
Samson (by Howells), I, 68. II, 304.
Samson and Delilah, II, 282.
Sancho Panza, II, 228; 304.
Sanctuary, A Bird Masque, II, 38, 314.
Sansone, I, 68.
Sanya; or, The Red Ribbon, II, 278.
Sappho, I, 274-275. II, 290.
Sappho and Phaon, II, 5; 28; 31-32; 313.
Saratoga, I, 38; 39; 40; 41; 50; 166. II, 302.
Sardou, Victorien, I, 12; 13; 21; 26; 31; 54; 122; 169; 249; 272.
Sargent Hickey, II, 299.
Sorglosen, Die, I, 31.
Saturday's Children, II, 236; 265.
Saved; An Emotional Drama, I, 79. II, 305.
Sazus Matatus, II, 136; 288.
Scarecrow, The, II, 28; 33-34; 38; 48; 314.
Schlimme Saat, I, 176.
Schwabenstreich, Der, I, 29.
Scott, Walter, I, 106.
Scribe, Eugène, I, 41n.
Scuffletown Outlaws, The, II, 242-243.
Sea Change, A; or, Love's Stowaway, I, 73-74. II, 304.
Secret, The, II, 269.
Secret Service, I, 7; 176; 223-228. II, 294.
Seine Erste und Einzige Leibe, I, 41.
Self, I, 4.
Self-Sacrifice, A Farce Tragedy, II, 305.
Senator, The, I, 104. II, 311.
Separation, I, 122-123. II, 273.
Serge Panine, I, 24. II, 281.

INDEX

- Serjeant James*, II, 105; 333.
Serpent's Tooth, A, II, 217; 323.
Servant in the House, The, II, 5; 155; 308.
Service for Two, II, 292.
Settled Out of Court, I, 222. II, 294.
Seven Keys to Balpate, II, 117; 275.
Seventh Daughter, The, II, 285.
Seventh Heaven, II, 111; 326.
Seven-Twenty-Eight; or, Casting the Boomerang, I, 29; 34. II, 281.
 Shakespeare, foreign productions of, by Augustin Daly, I, 34-35; adaptations of *The Taming of the Shrew*, 34, *As You Like It*, 35, *Twelfth Night*, 35, *Much Ado About Nothing*, 35, *The Merchant of Venice*, 35, *The Tempest*, 35.
 Shakespeare, inspiration from, II, 39-40.
Shakespeare the Playmaker, II, 241.
 Shakespeare, William, as a character, I, 32-33; 70-72. II, 17; 241.
Shame Woman, The, II, 247; 333.
 Shannon, Effie, I, 58.
Shattered Idol, A, II, 289.
 Shaw, Bernard, I, 67. II, 34.
She, I, 220. II, 294.
 Sheldon, Edward, II, 5; 86-99; birth and training, 86; treatment of slum life by, 86; of the negro question by, 87-88; of politics and business by, 88-89, 90; the period romance of, 92-94; the fanciful romance of, 94-96; illness of, 96; collaborators of, 96-97; review of the work of, 98; 123; 136; 144; 251.
 See also List of Plays.
Shenandoah, I, 57-60; 176; 249. II, 303.
Sherlock Holmes, I, 228-229. II, 295.
She Would Be a Soldier, I, 4.
Sho-Gun, The, II, 113; 263.
Shore Acres, I, 146-150. II, 300.
 Short, Marion, I, 194.
Show-Off, The, II, 225-226; 308.
Show Shop, The, II, 118; 293.
Shulamite, The, II, 310.
Siberia, I, 122. II, 273.
Signing of the Declaration of Independence, The, II, 266.
Silver Cord, The, II, 232-233; 304.
Silver Spoon, The, I, 14; 127; 162.
Simple Life, The, II, 299.
Sinbad the Sailor, II, 314.
Sinner, II, 76; 272.
Sinners, II, 284.
Sisters of Susannah, II, 318.
Six Cylinder Love, II, 120; 316.
 Skinner, Mrs. Otis, I, 271.
 Skinner, Otis, I, 2; 32; 200; 201; 270; 290. II, 18; 127; 151.
Sleeping Car, The, I, 74-75; 80. II, 304.
 Smith, F. Hopkinson, I, 245.
 Smith, Winchell, I, 57. II, 118-119. See also List of Plays.
Smoking Car, The, I, 78. II, 305.
Sniper, The, II, 320.
Social Swim, The, I, 272. II, 289.
 Society of Dramatic Authors, The, II, 4.
Soldiers of Fortune, I, 253. II, 285; 330.
Solon Shingle, I, 4.
Some One in the House, II, 307.
Son Daughter, The, I, 196. II, 270.
Song and Dance Man, The, II, 117-118; 275.
Song of Songs, The, II, 94; 325.
Sophie, II, 140; 318.
Sorceress, The, II, 278.
 Sothern, E. H., I, 54; 55; 104; 171; 200; 208; 242. II, 25; 30; 31.
So This Is London! II, 151; 296.
 Sousa, J. P., I, 117.
Speaking to Father, II, 115; 263.
Speak of the Devil, I, 261. II, 331.
Speculator, The, II, 271.
Spindrift, II, 328.
Spiritland, II, 266.
Spite Corner, II, 120; 276.
Spoilers, The, II, 3.
Sporting Thing To Do, The, II, 272.
Sprightly Romance of Marsac, The, II, 335.
Square Peg, A, II, 236; 266.
Squatter Sovereignty, I, 92. II, 298.
Squaw Man, The, II, 4; 123-125; 324.
S. S. Tenacity, II, 303.
 Stallings, Laurence, II, 234-236. See also List of Plays.
 Starr, Frances, I, 193. II, 135.
 Stee, II, 316.
 Stevens, Emily, II, 64.
 Stevenson, Christine Wetherill, II, 46-47.
Still Alarm, The, II, 265.
Still Waters, I, 261-262. II, 331.
 Stock companies, I, 2-3. II, 159.
 Stoddard, Lorimer, I, 204; 209.
Stolen Story, The, II, 68-69; 334.
 Stone, J. A., I, 4.
Storm of Thoughts, A, II, 266.
Straight Road, The, I, 289. II, 4; 291.
Stranger in New York, A, II, 306.
Stranglers of Paris, The, II, 267.
Straw, The, II, 173-175; 321.
 Strindberg, August, II, 170; 181.
 Strong, Austin, II, 111. See also List of Plays.
Strongheart, II, 286.
Struggle Everlasting, The, II, 125; 324.
Stubbornness of Geraldine, The, I, 278-279. II, 290.
Studio Picture, A, II, 328.
Successful Calamity, A, II, 77; 310.
Such a Charming Young Man, II, 264.

INDEX

Sudden Shower, *A*, II, 282.
Sudermann, Hermann, I, 32; 158. II, 94; 251.
Sue, I, 112. II, 299.
Sullivan, T. R., I, 204. *See also* List of Plays.
Sultan of Sulu, *The*, II, 113; 263.
Sun-Up, II, 246-247; 333.
Sunshine of Paradise Alley, *The*, II, 332.
Superfluous Husband, *The*, I, 272. II, 289.
Supper in Dixie, *A*, I, 6. II, 332.
Suppressed Desires, II, 162; 209; 296.
Surf, I, 38. II, 311.
Surgeon of Paris, *The*, I, 4.
Surprises du divorce, *Les*, I, 25.
Surrender, I, 245. II, 329.
Sweet Kitty Bellairs, I, 190-191. II, 269.
Swords, II, 228; 303.
Sylvian, II, 63; 318.
Sylvia Runs Away, II, 302.
Sylvia's Lovers, I, 168. II, 266.

T

Talk of New York, *The*, II, 275.
Tally Ho!, I, 117. II, 317.
Taming a Butterfly, II, 278.
Taming of Helen, *The*, II, 285.
Tarkington, Booth, II, 5; 60; 80-81; 126-129. *See also* List of Plays.
Tarnish, II, 215-216; 287.
Tavern, *The*, II, 275.
Taylor, Deems, II, 148.
Temperance Town, *A*, II, 119; 306.
Temper and Tempests; or, Extremes
Touch, II, 283.
Tempest, Marie, I, 289.
Tempest, *The*, II, 39.
Tent of Pompey, *The*, II, 331.
Terrible Meek, *The*, II, 155; 308.
Test Arrow, *The*, II, 283.
Test Case, *A*, I, 32. II, 283.
Texas Nightingale, *A*, II, 143.
Texas Steer, *A*, II, 306.
Thackeray, William, II, 63; 68.
Thankful Blossom, I, 112.
Thank You, II, 119; 325.
Thank You, Doctor, II, 287.
That Imprudent Young Couple, II, 274.
That Overcoat, II, 329.
Theatre, the closing of, during the Civil War, I, 3-4; call for an independent, 141; condition of, in 1900, II, 2-3; civic, 43; community, 45-49; decline in traveling company, 158; commercial spirit in, 159; rivalry of motion picture to, 158, 159; excessive competition in, 159; rise of independent, 160-163; conferences on the American, 164.

Theatre Guild, *The*, II, 137; 161.
Theatrical Syndicate, *The*, I, 189.
They Knew What They Wanted, II, 228-229; 304.
Things That Count, *The*, II, 136; 287.
Third Degree, *The*, II, 104; 309.
Thirst, II, 162; 168; 320.
Thirty Days, II, 297; 327.
39 East, II, 57; 277.
This Fine-Pretty World, II, 29; 37-38; 249; 314.
This Picture and That, I, 65. II, 315.
This Way Out, II, 276.
Thomas, Albert E., II, 25; 74-75. *See also* List of Plays.
Thomas, Augustus, I, 3; 60; 66; 239-264; birth and parentage, 239-240; training, 240-241; his advice to playwrights, 242; newspaper experience of, 242; acts as manager for Julia Marlowe, 242; joins staff of Madison Square Theatre, 243; establishes his reputation with *Alabama*, 243; its social and political effect, 244-245; treats of the trusts and of politics, 246-248; plays of the West, 248-251; his period of light comedy, 251-252; plays of mental influence, 253-256; treats double standard of morality, 256-258; Civil War plays of, 245, 258-261; personal liberty in plays of, 261-263; his achievement, 262-264; II, 1; 4; 5; 24; 54; 250. *See also* List of Plays.
Thompson, Denman, I, 128-129. *See also* List of Plays.
Thou Desperate Pilot, II, 264.
Thousand Years Ago, *A*, II, 28; 32; 314.
Three Bears, II, 274.
Three of Hearts, I, 258. II, 331.
Three of Us, *The*, II, 51; 276.
Three Wise Fools, II, 326.
Through Fire, I, 118. II, 272.
Through the Breakers, II, 284.
Through the Dark, II, 312.
Ticcy; or, That Little Affair of Boyd's, II, 295.
Tickless Time, II, 296.
Tiger! Tiger! II, 135; 310.
Tin Soldier, *A*, II, 306.
Tiote, II, 280.
Tireuse des Cartes, *La*, II, 278.
Tittle Murt, *The*, II, 274.
Toast of the Town, *The*, I, 271. II, 291.
To-day, II, 271.
Toddles, I, 290. II, 291.
Teller Einsfall, *Ein*, I, 221.
Tomorrow, II, 28; 35-36; 314.
Tongues of Men, *The*, II, 153; 274.
Too Many Cooks, II, 276.

INDEX

Too Much Johnson, II, 294.
Torchbearers, The, II, 225; 308.
Torrance, Ridgeley, II, 25.
To the Ladies, II, 220-222; 224; 276; 307.
Totheroh, Dan, II, 237-238.
Tourgee, A., I, 127.
Tradition, II, 317.
Trail of the Lonesome Pine, The, II, 334.
Transit of Leo, The, II, 283.
Trap, The, II, 285.
Travelling Salesman, The, II, 118; 293.
Treadway of Yale, I, 251.
Tricks, II, 283.
Trifles, II, 210; 296.
Triplet, James, I, 6.
Trip to Chinatown, A, II, 119; 122; 306.
Trista, II, 242.
Tristan and Isolde, II, 265.
Trollope, Anthony, I, 15.
Trombly, A. E., II, 48.
Trowbridge, J. T., I, 127; 128.
True-Born Hero, A, I, 79. II, 305.
True to the Core, II, 267.
Truth, The, I, 53; 287-289. II, 4; 291.
Tully, Richard Walton, I, 192. II, 129-131. *See also* List of Plays.
Turandotte, II, 32.
Turn to the Right, II, 119; 325.
Twain, Mark, I, 20; 38; 66; 110-116; speech after *Ah Sin*, 111; collaboration with Bret Harte, 110-111; with W. D. Howells, 115. II, 250. *See also* List of Plays.
Tweedles, II, 81; 327.
Twelve Miles Out, II, 111; 316.
Twins, II, 312.
Two Blind Beggars and One Less Blind, II, 137; 318.
Two Little Vagrants, II, 309.
Two Men from Sandy Bar, The, I, 109-110; 113. II, 299.
Two Sisters, The, II, 332.
Two Widows, The, I, 24. II, 279.

U

Ulric, Lenore, I, 197.
Ultimo, I, 26; 119.
Unchastened Woman, The, II, 76; 265.
Uncle Nat. See *Shore Acres*.
Uncle Tom's Cabin, I, 129.
Under Cover, I, 95. II, 299.
Undercurrent, II, 282.
Under the Gaslight, I, 11; 12; 164. II, 278.
Under the Polar Star, II, 268.
Undertow, The, II, 105; 333.
Unexpected Guests, The, I, 77-78; 80. II, 305.
Unionist's Daughter, The, I, 6.

Union Prisoner, The, I, 7.
Unofficial Patrol, An, I, 150.
Unwritten Law, The, II, 125; 324.
Up From Nowhere, II, 327.

V

Valabréque, Albin, I, 25.
Valerie, II, 268.
Van Der Decken, I, 196. II, 269.
Vanity Fair, I, 56. II, 63.
Varesi, Gilda, II, 157.
Varying Shore, The, II, 143; 264.
Veglione, Le, I, 272.
Veiller, Bayard, See List of Plays.
Vera, the Medium, II, 285.
Verge, The, II, 211; 296.
Verlorene Paradies, Das, I, 173.
Very Good Young Man, A, II, 302.
Vesta, I, 24. II, 280.
Vicar of Wakefield, The, I, 166.
Victor Durand, I, 203. II, 274.
Vie à Deux, I, 25.
Vie de Bohème, La, I, 272.
Vigilantes, The, or, The Heart of the Sierras, I, 119.
Virginian, The, I, 119. II, 272.
Vollmer, Lula, II, 246-247. *See also* List of Plays.
von Moser, Gustav, I, 26; 28; 30; 119; 215.
von Schönthan, Franz, I, 26; 27; 29; 30; 31.
von Schönthan, Paul, I, 26; 29.

W

Waddy Googan, I, 94. II, 299.
Wake Up Jonathan, II, 306; 323.
Wallack, Lester, I, 3; 16; 37; 38; 57. *See also* List of Plays.
Walsh, Blanche, I, 284.
Walter, Eugene, I, 10. II, 5; 105-109. *See also* List of Plays.
War Committee, A, II, 310.
Ward of France, A, II, 293.
Warfield, David, I, 189; 197.
War in Peace, II, 283.
Warnings, II, 168; 320.
Warrens of Virginia, The, II, 286.
Washington, George, plays dealing with, I, 248. II, 41-42.
Washington Square Players, The, II, 39; 137; 141; 161; 236.
Washington, the Man Who Made Us, II, 41-42; 314.
Watkins, Maurine, See List of Plays.
Wave of Life, A, I, 270.
Way Down East, I, 162. II, 332.

INDEX

Way of the World, The, I, 277. II, 290.
Way We Live, The, II, 280.
We Are Seven, II, 145; 294.
Web, The, II, 168; 320.
Welded, II, 184-185; 322.
Welt ohne Männer, Die, I, 290.
Wet Blanket, A, II, 282.
Wharton, Edith, I, 286.
What Happened to Jones, II, 102; 271.
What Price Glory, II, 234-235; 264; 326.
What Should She Do? or, Jealousy, I, 24.
 II, 279.
What The Doctor Ordered, II, 327.
What They Think, II, 277.
When Witches Ride, II, 242.
Where the Cross is Made, II, 171; 175; 321.
Whiffen, Mrs. Thomas, I, 168; 172.
Whiffen, Thomas, I, 168.
White Bird, The, II, 148; 301.
White Collars, II, 287.
White Desert, II, 233-234; 264.
White Dresses, II, 244.
White Sister, The, II, 276.
White Slave, The, I, 123. II, 273.
White Wings, II, 83-84; 266.
Who's Who, II, 285.
Why Marry? II, 69-72; 73; 334.
Why Not? II, 72-74; 75; 334.
Why Smith Left Home, II, 102; 271.
Widow's Son, The, I, 259.
Wife, The, I, 169-171. II, 75; 268; 286.
Wild Birds, II, 237-238; 332.
Wilde, Oscar, I, 54.
Wildfire, II, 271.
Williams, Jesse Lynch, II, 68-74. *See also* List of Plays.
Will of Song, The, II, 314.
Willow Tree, The, II, 132-133; 270.
Wilson, Francis, I, 283.
Wilson, H. L., II, 222.
Wine, Women and Cards, II, 266.
Wings, The, II, 18; 323.
Winnie and the Wolves, I, 235. II, 295.
Winterfeast, The, II, 155; 308.
Winter, William, I, 266.
Wisdom Tooth, The, II, 224; 276.
Witching Hour, The, I, 243; 253-255; 263.
 II, 5; 330.
Within an Inch of His Life, II, 267; 300.
Within the Law, II, 111; 333.
Wives, I, 51-52. II, 302.
Wolf, The, II, 106; 333.
Wolf of Gubbio, The, II, 22-23; 323.
Wolf, Pierre, I, 194.

Wolfville, I, 286. II, 291.
Woman, The, II, 286.
Woman Hater, The, II, 311.
Woman in the Case, The, I, 283-285. II, 4; 291.
Woman in White, The, I, 20.
Woman of the World, A, II, 329.
Woman's Honor, II, 296.
Woman's Way, A, II, 75-76; 271.
Woman's Won't, A, II, 281.
Won at Last, II, 312.
Wooden Spoon, A; or Perdita's Penates, II, 281.
Woodworth, Samuel, I, 127.
Woolen Stocking, The, II, 299.
Woolf, B. E., I, 6. *See also* List of Plays.
Wren, The, II, 327.
Wrong Mr. Wright, The, II, 271.
Wyndham, Sir Charles, I, 41.

Y

Yale University, I, 40. II, 81; 164.
Yankee Fantasies, II, 29; 36; 314.
Yankee in England, A, I, 4.
Yankee Prince, The, II, 275.
Yankee Tourist, The, II, 285.
Ye Earlie Trouble, II, 274.
Yellow Jacket, The, II, 132; 270; 300.
Yes or No, II, 296.
Yorick, II, 280.
Yorick's Love, I, 70-72; quotation from, 71-72. II, 304.
You and I, II, 81-82; 266.
Young America, I, 203. II, 335.
Young Blood, II, 293.
Younger Son, The, I, 176. II, 268.
Youngest, The, II, 82; 266.
Young Folks' Ways, I, 215.
Young Man's Fancy, A, II, 145; 316.
Young Mrs. Winthrop, I, 52-53; 57. II, 74; 167; 302.
Young, Sir Charles, I, 57.
Young, William, I, 200-203. *See also* List of Plays.
Young Wisdom, II, 56; 277.
Your Fiery Furnace, II, 244.
Your Humble Servant, II, 127; 326.

Z

Zanina; or, The Rover of Cambaye, II, 281.
Zaza, I, 177; II, 268.
Zone Police, The, II, 285.



3 6655 00107376 5

PS
332
.Q55
vol.2

26,538

PS
332 Quinn, Arthur Hobson
.Q55 History of the American
vol.2 Drama.

26,538

DATE	ISSUED TO

